

# THE ARENA.

VOL. XVIII.

OCTOBER, 1897.

No. 95.

## THE NEW OSTRACISM.

BY HON. CHARLES A. TOWNE.

This is true liberty : when freeborn men,  
Having to advise the public, may speak free ;

• • • • •  
What can be juster in a state than this? — *Euripides.*

THESE lines, better known from Milton's use of them as a motto to "Areopagitica" than from their original employment by the great Greek dramatist, may well serve as an introduction to an article designed to call attention to some particulars wherein liberty of speech, which includes liberty of instruction, and is the surest pledge, as it was the culminating achievement, of free institutions, is shown to have been partially lost already and, unless present tendencies are withstood, to be doomed to early extinction in the United States. Not, indeed, that thus far the laws have specifically limited the right to the expression of opinion, although lately the courts have in some instances used the writ of injunction as a substitute for unobtainable repressive legislation ; nor that in the realms of religious, philosophical, and even political discussion, so long as the latter deals with pure abstractions, a man may not still "speak free" his honest thoughts, either by word of mouth, if he can find listeners, or in print, if he can find readers ; — but that, in the domain of economic inquiry, as to questions of a nature to be submitted to political determination, especially if of present or imminent pendency, the expression of opinion is no longer free in fact.

Custom and usage are stronger than statutes and guarantees. Conditions may nullify law. A legislature, for exam-

ple, may undertake to assure absolute freedom of contract to every citizen, but circumstances may nevertheless compel millions to subscribe to terms dictated by scores. So also may the theory of a state and the letter of its laws guarantee absolute liberty of action to every voter in the casting of his ballot, yet all the while the control of that high function of his supposed sovereignty be as completely distinct from his own will as though he had signed it away by power of attorney. Thus it is wholly possible that a people should preserve all the outward forms and verbal warranties of liberty while drifting under the worst abuses of practical despotism. These come through usages instigated by powerful and selfish interests in the community and deriving their sanction from a permissive public opinion. In the United States to-day we need to be every whit as watchful respecting the growth of customs (with their accompanying justifying sentiments) whereof the natural operation is to limit the freedom appropriate to our institutions, as in regard to attempts at fundamental changes in our organic and statutory laws. The latter can rarely be accomplished in secret, and may be usually left to the fortunes of inevitable examination and debate. But the former, mysterious in origin, silent in action, and subtle in effect, elude common observation, are not easily exposed, and may long defy reformation. It can be regarded as nothing short of a marvellously happy circumstance if, when some especially dangerous and insidious purpose is afoot, there shall occur so startling and flagrant an example of what is aimed at as to shock the patriotic conscience of the country and, before "damned custom" has quite deadened it, arouse it to activity.

Two such occurrences have recently drawn the attention of the people of the United States to the danger that menaces their liberties through the control of the great educational forces of the country by influences distinctly hostile to the general good: the dismissal of Prof. Edward W. Bemis, from the faculty of the University of Chicago, about two years ago; and the recent enforced resignation of Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews from the Presidency of Brown University. The former circumstance caused much comment at the

time, but lacked somewhat the conclusive and exemplary character of the latter, because the dismissing powers undertook some kind of explanation in the Bemis case that left the real occasion of their action slightly and formally in issue; while in the Andrews case the motive is avowed with perfect and astounding candor.

Everybody is familiar with the history of the University of Chicago. Though depending practically upon the liberality of one man, no other institution of learning has ever been so prodigally endowed. Its founder and chief patron, evidently determined that his memory should "outlive his life" more than "half a year," was not content to depend alone on Hamlet's recipe and "build churches," although he had already acted upon it quite extensively. He seems to have feared that, if he relied on churches only, his posthumous reputation for benevolence might possibly suffer somewhat from his connection with the organization and development of the most gigantic, unrighteous, and oppressive monopoly in all the modern enginery of predatory commercialism. The taint of Standard Oil might prove stronger than the odor of sanctity exhaled from a few modest and unassertive churches. His case required something more than the ordinary tribute with which contemptuous wickedness, when it lies down to die, tries to mitigate the severity of the common judgment which it has all its life despised and outraged. What so apposite to his need as a great university, lavishly supplied with buildings, appliances, faculties, libraries, money; aggressive, demonstrative, devoted to his ideas, and eternally redolent of himself? The very thing!

Only a few millions of dollars were required, and these were easily to be procured. A fraction of a cent per gallon added to the price of illuminating oil would soon make good the expense. Talk of the philosopher's stone: it would have been but a sorry device compared to this new alchemy which converts necessity into gold, robbery into charity, and objur-gation into eulogy. To levy unwilling subsidy from whole commonwealths and sanctify the action by devoting a portion of the avails to chapel-building; to seize by mingled force and fraud a vast range of iron-hills and appurtenant railways,

with the usufruct of tributary cities, and stifle the resentment of humanity by taking the humanities into partnership in the business: these are conceptions beyond the audacity of all preceding centuries and whose realization would have rendered infamous any age but ours.

In the University of Chicago Prof. Edward W. Bemis held a position as an instructor or associate professor in the department of sociology. His duties comprised both class work inside the university proper, and, under the auspices of the institution, lectures in University Extension courses outside. He is a man of exceptional acquirements in his specialty, as may be seen from the following statement by the well-known authority Prof. John B. Clark:

Doctor Bemis has unusual qualifications for giving instructions in sociology in an institution where this branch of science is to be taught in a scientific way. His range of learning is very extensive and his training in economics has been very thorough. He has clear insight and sound judgment. His views are conservatively progressive, and he seems to be a safe guide for students.

He was a careful investigator of the problems of municipal government, and had largely studied such subjects as street-railways, gas manufacture, police management, etc., and had written much and with authority thereon. In the somewhat broader field also of monopolies in general, and labor questions, including strikes, boycotts, and lock-outs, he was a painstaking and indefatigable inquirer. On all these matters his deliverances were characterized by perfect candor and moderation, though it was plain that he was free from the common fault of bias in favor of the powerful interests of society, and that he possessed a sincere sympathy with those whose condition places them at a disadvantage in many of the struggles of life, though not blind to their shortcomings. He construed his liberty as a teacher in a broad spirit, and did not hesitate to state a fact he learned or an opinion he entertained. If, for example, he found that gas could be profitably made and furnished at a fraction of what the citizens of Chicago were paying for it, he had no reluctance to say so. If he ascertained that the municipal ownership and operation of gas-works had been successfully undertaken in



some cities, and thought that the experiment justified its extension to other places, he so stated. If, in passing, he felt called upon to characterize the conduct of persons engaged in any of the enterprises under his investigation, he did not fail to employ language clearly expressing his sentiments. If, when examining the history of a railroad strike, he found what seemed to him to be signs of dereliction on the part of the company, or anything in respect to which he thought some concession due to the men or their claims, he was in the habit, contrary to the prevalent custom in such cases, of making plain mention of the fact.

It is, therefore, not strange that dissatisfaction soon made itself evident upon the part of those who, either personally or as a class, constituted the main financial reliance of the University. Men could not, of course, be expected to contribute liberally to the furnishment and support of an institution whose spokesmen were permitted to cast suspicion upon the motives, or to question the righteousness of the acts, of those whose money paid their salaries. It was, accordingly, the most natural thing in the world that, in 1893, the president of the Chicago Gas Trust refused a desired financial favor to the University because Mr. Bemis was on its faculty.

Another illustrative instance is afforded by the effect produced by certain of Mr. Bemis's utterances wherein he betrayed a suspicion that there are sometimes two sides to a labor dispute. On Sunday, July 15, 1894, he delivered in the First Presbyterian Church in Chicago an address on "Some Lessons of the Strike," referring to the great railroad strike of that year. He condemned the strikers for their excesses and, among other things, said :

Unless, however, we who are not wage-earners in the narrower sense, purify our modes of nominating or electing or appointing officials and legislative bodies, and unless we stimulate among the general public a sympathetic and intelligent interest in the elevation of the masses, we must not wonder at the use by unscrupulous minorities of wage-workers of any weapons within their reach.

If the railroads would expect their men to be law-abiding, they must set the example. Let their open violation of the Inter-State Commerce law, and their relations to corrupt legislatures and assessors testify as to their part in this regard. I do not attempt to justify the strikers in their boycott of the railroads ; but the railroads themselves not long ago

placed an offending road under the ban and refused to honor its tickets. Such boycotts on the part of the railroads are no more to be justified than is a boycott of the railroads by the strikers. Let there be some equality in the treatment of these things.

Upon the conclusion of the address, the president of one of the great railway systems of the Northwest, with much excitement and passion, took the speaker to task for his strictures on the railroads, declaring: "It is an outrage. That a man *in your position* should *dare* to come here and imply that the railroads cannot come into court with clean hands, is infamous." (The italics are mine. The words emphasized seem to indicate an appreciation on the part of this railway president of a limitation on Mr. Bemis's right of criticism due to his position on the faculty of an institution peculiarly circumstanced.)

This gentleman went further, and made a complaint to certain of the trustees and to the president of the University. The latter thereupon addressed a letter to Prof. Bemis, in which he said (again the italics are mine, the reason for their employment being, I trust, sufficiently obvious):

Your speech at the First Presbyterian Church has caused me a great deal of annoyance. *It is hardly safe for me to venture into any of the Chicago clubs.* I am pounced upon from all sides. I propose that during the remainder of your *connection with the University* you exercise great care in public utterances about *questions that are agitating the minds of the people.*

When, some months afterward, Prof. Bemis's name was dropped from the list of instructors and the fact began to elicit comment, it was given out by certain members of the faculty and the president of the University, that he had been dismissed because of incompetency. It is not my purpose to decide nicely the dispute that followed on this head; but it is not difficult to understand that the holding of views different from those accepted and orthodox in the institution might readily pass with the regulars as a clear proof of incompetency. Certainly Prof. Bemis has much the preponderance of evidence in support of his contention that his services were dispensed with mainly because his opinions, and his expression of them, upon "questions that were agitating the minds of the people," to quote again from the president, made him

*persona non grata* to the powerful financial patrons of the University. This conclusion is further supported by the following statements of the president, none of which, so far as I am able to learn, has been denied. In a letter dated January 15, 1894 :

I hoped that, as time passed, there would be opportunity for your doing a larger amount of work in the University proper. . . . Instead of the opportunity becoming better for work on your part in the University proper, the doors seem to be closing. . . . I am persuaded that in the long run you can do in another institution, *because of the peculiar circumstances here*, a better and more satisfactory work to yourself than you can do here. I am personally very much attached to you. You are, however, man of the world enough to know that, unless one is in the best environments, he cannot work to the best advantage. *You are so well known and your ability so widely recognized*, that there will surely be no difficulty in securing for you a good position, one in which you will be monarch, and *one in which you will be*, above all things else, *independent*.

In a conversation with Prof. Bemis March 7, 1895 :

It is not a question of competency; simply the general situation is against you here.

In a conversation March 13, 1895, referring to the work Prof. Bemis had been doing in the Civic Federation and elsewhere on labor problems and municipal and monopoly questions, and replying to the suggestion by him that the University ought to be in close touch with such matters :

Yes, it is valuable work, and you are a good man to do it, but this may not be, — *this is not the institution where such work can be done*.

In the following signed statement of a very worthy and reputable gentleman, which I believe is now printed for the first time, reference is made to most significant alleged utterances of the president which Prof. Bemis has frequently cited, with offers to substantiate his proof of them in the manner therein indicated. It cannot fail to be considered remarkable, if the reported expressions were never used, that these challenges have not been tested. The double testimony of Prof. Bemis and Mr. Holbrook to the fact of the report of the president's words by men of the high character which both agree in ascribing to them, assuredly entitles the former to demand that the statement be believed if the investigation be refused.

CHICAGO, ILLS., March 5th, 1896.

When Prof. Bemis was dismissed from the University of Chicago, President Harper, in a printed statement, endorsed as a true explanation, the words of Prof. Small: "Instead of erring by teaching views, the head and front of his offending was that he did not seem to present any distinct views whatever."

On the other hand, it was claimed by Mr. Bemis that the dismissal was clearly due to commercial considerations, and in support of this view he published the letters of President Harper and offered to produce, before any disinterested umpire the President might name, the testimony of two very prominent gentlemen, but the offer was ignored.

In order, therefore, to justify to the readers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* my action in asking Prof. Bemis to become editor in sociology, I sought out the two men to whom reference was made. One of these, who has a world-wide reputation for ability and scholarship, tells me that he was informed by President Harper a few months before Mr. Bemis was dropped: "I am on the capitalists' side every time, — there is where I get my money." This gentleman further says that during the same conversation President Harper expressed his displeasure over the fact that Mr. Bemis had irritated some wealthy men, and declared few donors desired the teaching of liberal views.

The other gentleman, known to thousands of scholarly people as an unusually successful lecturer, and as a man of undoubted veracity, tells me that President Harper, in conversation with him about four months before Prof. Bemis was dropped, criticised with warmth an address of the latter, wherein he condemned most strikes and all violence, but stated that the railroads also violated law. The President said to my informant: "It is all very well to sympathize with the workingmen, but we get our money from those on the other side, and we cannot afford to offend them."

The testimony of these two men would carry conviction to any jury of President Harper's peers, and left in my mind no shadow of doubt that, in his enthusiasm over Mr. Rockefeller's gifts, President Harper had forgotten the real condition of mind that he was in previous to the dismissal of Mr. Bemis and the real reasons that actually did influence him in dropping from the University so able and scholarly a gentleman.

(Signed) Z. SWIFT HOLBROOK,

*Editor Bibliotheca Sacra.*

In view of these various considerations it would seem as though that were not less prophecy than purpose which was said to Prof. Bemis by the head of a great gas monopoly, in 1893, viz.: "If we can't convert you, we are going to down you. We can't stand your writing. It means millions to us."

Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews has for some years been President of Brown University at Providence, R. I. A man of impressive personal character and great executive ability, he

has been conspicuous among the leading college presidents of the country, and under his guidance the institution has made unprecedented progress. Of unusual native abilities, informed and disciplined by wide acquirements and broad culture, a writer of established authority in history and economics, he has reflected lustre upon his office and credit upon his country. For many years he has been a profound student of the history and science of money. He has published from time to time articles and books on those subjects, and was one of the delegates of the United States to the International Monetary Conference which met at Brussels in 1892. In common with the vast majority of scholars and economists of the world he is a believer in bimetallism. Until recently he has held to the opinion that the reëstablishment of that system ought to be attempted only by a concert of the leading commercial nations; but about a year ago he took the position, in effect, that the evils of gold monometallism are too awful to be permitted to continue, and that this great nation can and should take initiative action in the restoration of silver coinage. These views he has not forced on anybody's attention. He has not taught them in the college curriculum, since the chair he holds, in addition to the presidency, is that of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy; nor is it charged that he has taken any pains to inculcate them privately among the pupils of the institution. His advocacy of his principles has been dignified and consistent. When he has been asked to state them, he has not hesitated to do so by speech and by pen, fully, forcefully, and felicitously.

But even this could not be endured by the advocates of the gold standard. Few parallels exist to the bigotry and intolerance of those partisans. That their opponents present arguments, adduce facts, and draw inferences that are at least professedly based on logical principles, is with them no good ground for conceding the right of discussion. They will not discuss. They will merely denounce and vilify. They deny that there is an issue. They foreclose debate by refusing out of hand to admit that the other side has either brains or morals, or a cause. One of the most violent representatives of this school of compulsory opinion is a certain

distinguished Member of Congress from Massachusetts, chairman of one of the financial committees in the House of Representatives. Of many amiable qualities of private character, he is yet a typical champion of the iron folly of the gold standard. He is honestly convinced of his own infallibility, and firmly believes that his judgment on a matter ought to be, in itself, a final cause of belief to other men. To differ from him is to be *ipso facto* convicted of mental imbecility, and, in extreme cases, of moral depravity. Challenged on the floor of the House for the basis of a conclusion announced by him in debate, I have heard him declare, drawing himself to his full height and glowing with the very sublimity of confidence: "It is so *because I say so*." He it was who, on the 17th of June last, brought before the corporation of Brown University the matter of President Andrews's position on the coinage of silver, and the relation of that fact to the welfare of the institution financially considered. As a consequence a committee was appointed to confer with the president. The avowed object of the conference, the true ground of the corporation's action, and the result thus far, are exhibited in the following correspondence:

To the Rev. E. Benjamin Andrews, D. D., President of Brown University:

In compliance with your request, the undersigned, members of a committee appointed at the last meeting of the corporation of Brown University, make the following statement:

The committee was appointed under the following resolution, to wit:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of the Chancellor, Judge Durfee, and Prof. Wayland, be appointed to confer with the President in regard to the interests of the university.

The resolution was passed after remarks from several members of the corporation, showing more specifically the reason for it. The makers of these remarks expressed the highest appreciation of the services rendered by the President in increasing and diversifying the educational facilities and efficiency of the university and in multiplying the number of the students resorting to it, and at the same time professed for him personally the warmest admiration and regard.

They signified a wish for change in only one particular, having reference to his views upon a question which constituted the leading issue in the recent Presidential election, and which is still predominant in national politics, namely, that of the free coinage of silver as legal tender at a ratio of sixteen ounces of silver to one of gold.

They considered that the views of the President, as made public by him from time to time, favored a resumption of such coinage, and expressed the belief that these views were so contrary to the views gener-



ally held by the friends of the university that the university had already lost gifts and legacies which otherwise would have come or have been assured to it, and that without change it would, in the future, fail to receive the pecuniary support which is requisite to enable it to prosecute with success the grand work on which it has entered.

The change hoped for by them, they proceeded to explain, is not a renunciation of these views, as honestly entertained by him, but a forbearance, out of regard for the interests of the university, to promulgate them, especially when to promulgate them will appeal most strongly to the passions and prejudices of the public.

The subscribers understand that it was in pursuance of this hope that the resolution appointing them a committee to confer with the President was passed, and passed, too, it may be added, without a single dissenting voice or vote.

[Signed]      WILLIAM GODDARD,  
                     THOMAS DUFEE,  
                     FRANCIS WAYLAND.

July 16, 1897.

To the Advisory and Executive Committee of the corporation of Brown University:

Gentlemen:—Believing that, however much I might desire to do so, I should find myself unable to meet the wishes of the corporation as explained by the special committee appointed to confer with me on the interests of the university, without surrendering that reasonable liberty of utterance which my predecessors, my faculty colleagues, and myself have hitherto enjoyed, and in the absence of which the most ample endowment for an educational institution would have but little worth, I respectfully resign the Presidency of the university, and also my professorship therein, to take effect not later than the first day of the approaching September.

I regret the brevity of the intervening time, but am acting at the earliest possible moment, after securing an interview with the committee.

Thanking you, gentlemen, and all the other members of the corporation, for the goodwill toward me personally which has been expressed in so many ways, and cherishing the best wishes for the prosperity of the university, I am yours, with sincere esteem,

[Signed]      E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS.  
 Providence, R. I., July 17, 1897.

It will be observed that the position of the discipliners of Dr. Andrews is stated with perfect frankness.

1. They object to his position in favor of "the free coinage of silver as legal tender at a ratio of sixteen ounces of silver to one of gold," which they describe as "the leading issue" at the last election and as "still predominant in national politics."

2. They demand of him "a forbearance . . . to promulgate" his views on this question.

3. They base this demand on,

a. "The interests of the University," which (1) have been sacrificed by the loss already of "gifts and legacies" which but for his views "would have come or been assured to" the University; and (2) are imperilled by the certainty of loss of "financial support" in the future; and

b. On the added consideration of the impolicy of promulgating his views "when to promulgate them will appeal most strongly to the passions and prejudices of the public."

This document is one of the most humiliating to our national spirit in all American history. In it confession is made of the bald and naked fact that, if its theory is correct and to be acted on, dollars are finally in absolute dominion in our affairs; because when the sequestered halls of learning become places to hawk and huckster in, with the very jewel of the mind, its liberty, the subject of the traffic, there can be no profanation in holding everything for sale.

But if this letter of the committee contains the full thesis of the claim that the money power must be permitted to control academic opinion, the answer of President Andrews is as compendious a statement of the opposite contention. He resigns because he will not surrender, and he refuses to surrender because:

1. To do so would be to renounce "that reasonable liberty of utterance" which his predecessors, his colleagues, and himself had theretofore enjoyed; and

2. Without this "reasonable liberty of utterance . . . the most ample endowment for an educational institution would have but little worth."

The publication of this correspondence awakened intense interest and was followed by widespread discussion. As a rule, the gold-standard and monopoly press sustained vigorously the action of the corporation and attacked viciously the attitude of the president and the cause of bimetallism. Some of this comment will be hereafter noticed. It is agreeable to know that, in general, the great profession of teaching, and especially those engaged in the work of higher education, have been quick to see the ruinous influence which the common acceptance and practice of the corporation's the-

ory would exert, not only upon their profession, but upon liberty of thought and speech in its broadest sense, and have rushed to the defence of independence in opinion almost without distinction as to economic and political belief.

Of this sentiment no more forceful or lofty expression has been given than in the "*Open Letter*" addressed to the corporation on July 31st by twenty-four of the leading members of the faculty of Brown University itself. The letter begins with a reference to the gravity of the situation :

If we are not mistaken, more is involved than the exigencies of a single institution or the fortunes of a single educator.

The action of the corporation, it declares,

is open to the gravest objections and rests upon a theory which, if extensively acted upon, would eat the heart out of our educational institutions, — the theory that the material growth of a University is of more importance than independence of thought and expression on the part of its professors, and that boards of trustees have, as such, the right to suggest limitations upon such independence.

The body of the letter is concerned with showing, first, that the action of the corporation

cannot be justified on the lower ground of pecuniary necessity and advantage; and, secondly, that it lacks all justification when considered from that higher point of view from which the educational institutions of a great country ought always to be regarded.

In support of the first proposition it is stated that in not having received lavish contributions of money Brown University has not differed from most educational institutions in that section; that such benefactions have been generally fewer among New-England colleges of late years even than formerly; that under the administration of President Andrews there has been "an unprecedented increase" in the number of students and a consequent growth in income, the latter rising from \$67,064 in 1889 to \$159,828 in 1897, so that, even "if income be a fit criterion, he is entitled to be regarded as, in a pecuniary sense, the greatest benefactor Brown University has ever had."

Against the theory advanced by a great newspaper that in these very practical days of the closing years of the nineteenth century the final test of a college president is his ability to draw funds toward the treasury of the institution over which he presides,

the letter eloquently contends that

the final test is, at the end of the century, what it was at the beginning of the century, what it has been in all preceding centuries—the existence or the non-existence of that personal power which, with money or without money, can take hold of an institution and lift it from a lower to a higher plane, which can seize upon the imagination and the moral natures of young men and transform them into something more scholarly, and manly, and noble.

On the second proposition the point is made that the president's position is sustained by the general argument for freedom of speech which has been conceded in Rhode Island for two hundred and sixty years; and, in the way of precedent and estoppel, a centre shot is scored as follows:

It is even conceded that, in the general case, college professors may with propriety give public utterance to their political opinions. Your honorable body have affirmed in the most striking manner the propriety of their doing so, by granting a member of the faculty leave of absence during seven weeks of the last autumn term in order that he might make Republican political speeches in the West.

With great cogency the protesting instructors argue that the only condition under which truth can be developed and known is under the free play of open contest with error.

"Even though the doctrines of 'free silver,'" say they, "be the blackest and most foolish of heresies, we do the commonwealth no service if we attempt, by official pressure, to close up their channels of expression."

They hold that the president of an institution of learning is under no obligation to conform his public expressions to the views of its trustees or the community; that

it is not the proper function of a university to "represent" or to advocate any favored set of political, any more than of religious, doctrines, but rather to inspire young men with the love of truth and knowledge, and, with freedom and openness of mind, to teach how these are to be obtained. It is to give a liberal, not a dogmatic education.

With conclusive force it is shown that it is not for the good of Brown University itself that its president should be officially restrained:

On the one hand we have the problematic or imaginary addition of a certain number of dollars. On the other hand we have, throughout the whole intellectual life of the University, the deadening influence of known or suspected repression. Our students will know or suspect that on certain subjects the silence of their president has been purchased or imposed. If the resignation of Dr. Andrews is accepted, the burden and

the stigma fall on his successor. We conceive that it will be hard to persuade a man of such independence as characterized Wayland, and Sears, and Robinson, and Andrews, to accept the difficult task under these new conditions. If our young men suspect what we have intimated concerning his public utterances, they will suspect it of his class-room instructions. If they suspect it of the president, they will suspect it of the professors. Confidence in the instruction of the University is fatally impaired.

In conclusion, this remarkable letter, after disavowing any sympathy with Dr. Andrews's financial views on the part of nearly all the writers, and stating that it is not dictated by either personal regard for him or admiration for his services to the University, declares :

Interested in the most obvious manner in the material prosperity of the institution, . . . we nevertheless would not see its prosperity advanced,—and we do not believe that its real prosperity *can* be advanced,—by private suppression and politic compliance: *for we are convinced that the life-blood of a University is not money, but freedom.*

It then calls on the corporation to refuse to accept President Andrews's resignation at its meeting September 15th. The event cannot be known before this article goes to press.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the question raised by this case of President Andrews. It is the first prominent instance where the allied forces of the gold standard have openly asserted their right to control a great institution of learning. Is it to be taken as an indication that a policy is being definitely shaped for the education of the people into a condition where they will not only lack the spirit to oppose the money and monopoly systems that must by and by enslave them, but will glibly reason out and justify by argument the righteousness, or at least the inexcusableness, of their oppression? For, be it observed, the defence of the action taken by the corporation of Brown University is not based on a denial of the great general principles whereon freedom of speech rests, but proceeds by a kind of confession and avoidance, admitting the necessity of that freedom, but claiming that the case made does not come within its sanction. It is at this point that danger threatens. It is here that the purpose of tyranny unmistakably appears. For it is clear that they who would shackle opposite opinions have no sure faith in their own. By pro-

posing to appeal from right to might, they show a dread of the issue of a fair combat and a plain intention to forestall it. The great struggle of the centuries is on us. If we can but keep open the avenues of access to the minds and hearts of men, we shall yet be able to build therein secure and impugnable fortresses against the organized selfishness of the world. In the eloquent words of Milton :

The temple of Janus, with his two controversial faces, might now not unsignificantly be set open. And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously, by licensing and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. . . . For who knows not that truth is strong, next to the Almighty ; she needs no policies, nor stratagems, nor licensings to make her victorious ; *those are the shifts and defences that error uses against her power.*

We who believe in the principles of bimetallism, and who, opposing the gold standard and all the cognate and collusive evils that are harnessed with it, are ready in the name of the Lord to go up against the mighty, have chosen Truth for our champion. "Let her and falsehood grapple."

The New York *World*, voicing the disposition of those who refuse to Dr. Andrews the right to invoke the recognized prerogatives of free speech, says :

Dr. Andrews has grossly discredited his own intelligence, and when a college president does that it is not only the right but the duty of its trustees to ask for his resignation. It is their principal function to see to it that the men they employ as instructors of youth shall be men of logical mind and sound intelligence. . . . The state of that [his] mind is as unfit for purposes of teaching as if it had lost faith in the multiplication table.

The New York *Sun*, another champion of this view, thus bluntly states it :

If he is right, there is no use for colleges. A professor of ethics who should deliver a series of lectures on the advantages of grand and petit larceny would be no more out of place than a college president who devotes himself to preaching free silver. *The question of the freedom of opinion and the free expression of opinion is not involved.*

Congressman Walker, of Massachusetts, the accepted instigator of the corporation's action, has deemed it necessary, in his *ex post facto* vindication of his course, to avoid the premises of the free-speech principle by insisting upon the essential immorality of the doctrine of free coinage.



Again, the *Boston Journal* says : " The free-silver question is both a moral and a political one."

Here then is the plan : All the traditions and guarantees of freedom of opinion and of its expression are to be respected and maintained : only, they are simply not to apply to the opinion and speech of those who advocate the free coinage of both gold and silver ! These are to be put beyond the pale of tolerance because they are imbecile and wicked. Undoubtedly, also, it is in contemplation to enlarge this category soon so as to embrace all advocacy of doctrines that may be deemed pernicious or fallacious by these self-made censors. Then, when this has been accomplished, discussion will be perfectly free ; you shall find then no more loud proclaimer of the liberty of speech than your gold-standard-monopoly-trust champion. The reign of greed will have been established definitively, and genius and learning will be " free " to prove that its kingship is of " divine right." Rapacity will be uncontrolled and uncontrollable, for it will prove itself to be both inevitable and just. The people will suffer, to be sure, but they must needs make shift to be reasonable and patient. To question the wisdom of the arrangement would be idiotic ; to wish it otherwise would be impious. Thus, in strict logic and morality, evil will be good, and slavery will be liberty ; " for," as Shakespeare makes Hamlet say, " There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." All this, as a matter of definitions !

I am far from claiming absolute license for either opinion or speech on behalf of men at the head of educational institutions. Extreme cases may readily be supposed. If, for example, the president of a college were known to be in favor of the abrogation of all criminal laws and the assumption of capital punishment into the hands of private persons who should be absolute judges when they should inflict it ; or if he were in the habit of giving public utterance by speech and pen to the proposition that every man should be free to determine for himself what statutes, if any, he would obey, or whose property he would appropriate ; in such a case there would be, unquestionably, a general agreement that he should be deposed, and nobody would complain that any safeguard of

liberty had been impugned. But it is into the same category with such ultra examples as these that the critics of Dr. Andrews place the advocacy of the free coinage of silver.

Now the supporters of bimetallism maintain that accepted doctrines of political economy as old as the science itself are the foundation of their argument; and they point to the fact, taking the world together (and the money question affects the whole world), that an overwhelming majority of the teachers of that science are advocates of their faith. They also instance that one of the basic contentions of their school is that the very justice and morality which the opposition prates of demand the overthrow of the existing monetary system, known as the gold standard, and are ready with countless attested examples to prove its inequitable and oppressive operation. These are subjects of statistics, and, as a matter of fact, the most of them are not even denied by the majority of the champions of the gold standard. With this support the bimetallists defy their opponents to meet them in argument, and even challenge prejudice and ignorance to subject themselves to the natural and unforced influence of a full investigation. To avoid this issue by an attempted excommunication of its proponents from a cult self-created for the very purpose of escaping the impossible task of defence, is preposterous and ridiculous. The attempt to do so needs, I believe, only to be brought sharply to the notice of the common sense and patriotism of the American people to be repudiated with scorn and laughter.

It will not do to say that these observations are beside the point because the claim they are aimed at is directed, not against bimetallism as such, but against the proposed attempt to attain it by the independent action of the United States; for the reasons, first, that all kinds of bimetallism rest upon identical charges against gold monometallism; that, moreover, the affirmative argument for independent action is precisely of the same nature as that for concerted action, involving the operations of the same principles, the same causes, and contemplating the same result. The whole difference between them is one of degree only, and is to be determined by the individual judgment to which the considerations

are addressed. That six and a-half millions of American citizens deliberately voted for the proposition last year, rescues it from the presumptuous intellectual contempt and the affected moral reprobation of both those who directly profit by the infamies of the gold standard and those who are in any manner suborned to its defence.

"If," says Bluntschli, "opinions are erroneous, they call out truth, and thus error serves, though against its will, the same end as truth. The external coercion of a government, violence, is never the right means to obtain the victory of truth over error; for truth, which is spirit, can only ground and maintain itself upon its own spiritual power."

And error, let us hope and believe, though she invoke subtle social forces in the place of outworn violence, attempting to wear the spiritual panoply of truth to cover up her own deformity, must by and by stand unmasked in the presence of the righteous resentment of the nation.

# THE CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH, ITS CAUSES AND RESULTS.

BY HERMAN E. TAUBENECK.

## PART II.

### THE NATIONAL BANKING ACT.

**I**N 1863 Congress passed the National Banking act, which enabled the bondholder to deposit his bonds with the Secretary of the Treasury and receive ninety per cent of their face value in banknotes, with which to start a bank.

To illustrate our National-Bank system, we will suppose that in the city of St. Louis are five persons who own \$20,000 each of United States bonds. These five persons can organize a National Bank as follows :

First. They will deposit their bonds with the Secretary of the Treasury at Washington, D. C., as security for the banknotes to be issued.

Second. The Secretary of the Treasury will then issue to them \$90,000 in banknotes, and charge them a tax of one per cent per annum to pay for printing and engraving.

Third. These five persons can then take these banknotes, return to St. Louis, open their bank, and loan the notes to the people.

This is the way National Banks are created. They are only creatures of the law, and derive all their rights and privileges from Congress. (a) These five persons will have \$100,000 in bonds deposited at Washington, drawing interest from the government. (b) They will have \$90,000 in banknotes loaned to the people at home, upon which they receive interest. Thus, with an original capital of \$100,000 in bonds to start with, this law has increased their capital to \$190,000, or, in other words, it enables them to receive *two interests upon one investment*. By law they are permitted to harvest two crops where they plant but one. Thus, every dollar of profit which has been made out of this system since

1863 has been money legislated into the pockets of the bankers and out of the pockets of the people. It is a difficult task to find out the amount of wealth this act has legislated out of the pockets of the people. Mr. N. A. Dunning, in the *National Watchman* for June 22, 1893, says :

No other business can show such enormous profits or has become such a menace to our free institutions. Below are given the figures of the profits of one bank, the First National Bank of New York City. These figures are from a speech of Senator Vest's in 1888. It will be of interest to read them carefully. The statement begins with 1873. The capital stock was \$500,000. The surplus, dividends, and annual profits are given below :

	DIVIDENDS.	SURPLUS.	PROFITS.
1873.....	\$75,000		
1874.....	70,000		
1875.....	60,000		
1876.....	60,000		
1877.....	60,000.....	\$736,700	
1878.....	60,000.....	1,142,700.....	\$466,000
1879.....	600,000.....	1,767,700.....	1,225,000
1880.....	150,000.....	2,441,800.....	824,100
1881.....	200,000.....	3,010,500.....	798,700
1882.....	200,000.....	3,477,700.....	667,200
1883.....	200,000.....	3,437,700.....	160,000
1884.....	200,000.....	3,718,100.....	550,400
1885.....	200,000.....	4,322,800.....	734,700
1886.....	200,000.....	5,095,500.....	972,700
1887.....	200,000.....	534,800.....	489,300

Let every reader of this article consider well the importance of this table, — \$6,668,100 profit on \$500,000 in ten years. . . . All this vast amount has been contributed by labor in production for the use of a tool of exchange that the government should furnish. This is the tribute paid to a single bank. From it can be estimated what 3,700 banks have received.

Every banknote which goes into circulation costs the people double interest: First, the government issues bonds and pays interest on them; second, the bankers deposit these bonds and receive ninety per cent in banknotes, for which the people, to get them into circulation, must also pay interest. Thus, under the National-Bank system it costs the people from ten to fifteen per cent annually for every dollar of banknotes put into circulation. Suppose the government should issue this money directly to the people, and pay it out for debts and the expenses of running the government? This

would pay off the bonds, stop the interest, reduce taxation, and put the money into circulation without paying any interest whatever.

#### CLASS LEGISLATION.

Think of the class legislation which surrounds our National-Bank system? Has Congress ever enabled the farmer to reap two crops of corn or cotton where he planted but one? No. Has Congress ever enabled the laborer to receive pay for two days' work when he has worked but one? No. Has our government ever permitted the farmer, merchant, manufacturer, or any other citizen, *except the bondholder*, to deposit his property with the Secretary of the Treasury, and receive as a loan ninety per cent of its value from the government? No. Why then should Congress grant this privilege to the bondholder and exclude all others? Is it any wonder that under such a banking system, which permits one class to reap twice where they plant but once, the wealth of our country has become concentrated within the last thirty years?

Suppose Congress should by law provide ways and means by which the farmer could reap two crops where he plants but one? Would not he also prosper and accumulate wealth as easily as the National Banks have done? The financial policy of our government for more than thirty years has been an exceedingly paternal one for the bankers and bondholders, but an exceedingly infernal one for the farmer and the laborer. These are harsh words, but not harsh enough by a thousandfold to express the honest indignation for any law which will permit one class to reap twice where they have planted but once, at the expense of every other class.

#### DEMOCRACY OF JEFFERSON.

Think of Grover Cleveland and many other leaders of the Democratic party calling themselves followers of Jefferson and Jackson! When Jefferson said, "A privileged class is a dangerous class." In a letter to Mr. Taylor dated May 28, 1816, he said:

The system of banking we have both equally and ever reprobated. I



contemplate it as a blot left in all of our constitutions, which, if not converted, will end in their destruction, which is already hit by the gamblers in corruption and is sweeping away in its progress the fortunes and morals of our citizens. . . .

And I sincerely believe, with you, that banking institutions are more dangerous than standing armies, and that the principle of spending money, to be paid by posterity, under the name of funding, is but swindling futurity on a large scale.

In 1803 he wrote to Mr. Gallatin :

This institution [National Bank] is one of the most deadly hostilities existing against the principles and form of our government. . . . Ought we then to give further growth to an institution so powerful, so hostile? . . . Now, while we are strong, it is the greatest duty we owe to the safety of our constitution to bring this powerful enemy to a perfect subordination under its authorities. The first measure would be to reduce them to an equal footing with other banks, as to the favors of the government.

On September 11, 1813, he wrote to Mr. Eppes :

Bank paper must be suppressed, and the circulating medium must be restored to the nation, to which it belongs. . . .

Treasury bills, bottomed on taxes, bearing or not bearing interest as may be found necessary, thrown into circulation, will take the place of so much gold or silver, which last, when coined, will find an afflux into other countries, and thus keep up the quantum of medium at its salutary level.

Andrew Jackson said :

If Congress has the right, under the Constitution, to issue paper money, it was given them to be used by themselves and not to be delegated to individuals or corporations.

This is Jeffersonian Democracy, and is indorsed by all Democracy's great leaders, as Calhoun, Benton, and hundreds of others.

#### THE CONTRACTION ACT.

In 1866 Congress passed the Contraction act, which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to receive United States currency and greenbacks and exchange them for interest-bearing bonds. The purport of this act was that any person holding United States currency or greenbacks could take them to the Secretary of the Treasury, have them destroyed, and receive bonds in exchange.

This act, from 1866 to 1873, destroyed more than one-half of the money of the United States. The following

table, for which I am indebted to Congressman Davis, of Kansas, gives the volume of money for each year from 1866 to 1873, as published by the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* in 1878 :

YEAR.	CURRENCY.	POPULATION.	PER CAPITA.
1866.....	\$1,803,702,726.....	35,537,148.....	\$50.76
1867.....	1,330,414,677.....	36,269,502.....	36.68
1868.....	817,199,773.....	37,016,949.....	22.08
1869.....	750,025,989.....	37,779,800.....	19.85
1870.....	740,039,179.....	38,568,371.....	19.19
1871.....	734,244,774.....	39,750,073.....	18.47
1872.....	736,340,912.....	40,978,606.....	17.97
1873.....	733,291,749.....	42,245,110.....	17.48

This table informs us that our money volume was contracted from \$1,803,702,726 in 1866 to \$733,291,749 in 1873, or from a per-capita circulation of \$50.76 to one of \$17.48. Within seven years this act destroyed more than one-half of the volume of money and decreased the price of all property in a corresponding ratio, so that in 1873 one dollar would buy as much products and property as did two in 1866. All writers on political economy agree "that the price of property increases or decreases in the same proportion as the volume of money is increased or decreased." This is an immutable law of finance which no government can annul. The late Professor Walker said :

That prices will fall or rise as the volume of money is increased or diminished, is a law that is as immutable as any law of nature.

The United States Monetary Commission Report says :

While the volume of money is decreasing, although very slowly, the value of each unit of money is increasing in a corresponding ratio and property is falling in price.

Suppose the value of all the property in the United States is \$65,000,000,000, and the volume of money, as published by the Secretary of Treasury, September 1, 1896, is \$1,539,169,643. We then have \$42.23 worth of property for every dollar of money. Therefore, every time we destroy one dollar of money we reduce the value of our property \$42.23. A reduction of one-half of our money volume would carry with it a destruction of \$32,500,000,000 in the value of our property, and a corresponding increase in the value of all credits.

Suppose (other things being equal) we destroy one-half the freight cars in the United States. What would be the result? Then one car would have to do as much work as two are now doing. The demand for cars would be twice as great as their supply. This would double their value.

Again, suppose (other things being equal) we destroy one-half the corn in the United States; what would be the result? Then our demand for corn would be as great as it now is, but the supply only one-half. This would double the value or price of corn. This is the law of supply and demand. The value of every article which enters the channels of trade and commerce is subject to this inexorable law. Whenever the supply is increased beyond the demand, prices will go down; but when restricted and cut off, they will go up.

Again, suppose (other things being equal) our government destroys one-half the volume of money in circulation, as the Contraction act of 1866 did, what would be the result? Then one dollar would have to do as much work as two are now doing. The demand for money would be doubled; this would also double its value, its purchasing power, so that one dollar would buy as much property as two dollars will buy to-day. What effect would this have on the industries of our country?

First. It would reduce the value of property one-half; it would reduce wages and the price of farm products one-half; it would destroy the ability of the debtor class to pay by one-half; so that two bushels of corn or two days of work would pay no more debts than one will pay to-day.

Second. It would double the value of all credits, as bonds, notes, mortgages, and other securities. It would double the value of the rate of interest. It would double the value of the salaries of all public officials. Why? Because the purchasing power of the money would be doubled, so that the creditor and the fixed-income classes could buy as much labor with fifty dollars as they now can with one hundred, and it would be just as hard for a debtor to pay a debt of fifty dollars as it is now to pay one hundred.

Thus the supply and demand of money is as great to determine the price for which labor and property shall be sold,

as the supply and demand of products and property combined; just as a decrease in the supply of any one commodity, say corn or cotton, affects its price only, so a decrease in the volume of money will affect the price of all commodities alike. Suppose the supply of each article which enters the channels of commerce and trade should be cornered by a few speculators, that is, a special corner for each article produced? Think of the power of these corners to fix prices which the people would have to pay! Again, suppose on the opposite side of these corners we should have one more corner, a corner on money. The power of this one corner on money would be as great to fix the price of products and property as all the other corners combined.

Suppose you loan your neighbor one hundred dollars, for which he agrees to deliver you one hundred bushels of wheat next fourth of July? Again, suppose that between now and next fourth of July Congress should pass an act declaring that a bushel of wheat shall consist of 120 pounds instead of 60 pounds, and compel your neighbor to measure his wheat by this new bushel? What would be the result? Why, you would be getting two bushels of wheat for one, and your neighbor would have to cultivate twice the number of acres, do twice the amount of work next year, to pay that debt, that he would have to do this year, when he borrowed the money. By law the value of your note would be doubled, and the ability of your neighbor to pay destroyed one-half. An act of this kind would be looked upon as a crime, and could never be enforced. No statesman or party dares to go before the people advocating such a law; but the Contraction act of 1866, which destroyed one-half of our money volume, accomplished this identical thing, with this difference only, that the Contraction act doubled the purchasing power of money and left the size of the bushel measure as it now is; while this other law would double the size of the bushel measure and leave the purchasing power of money as it was in 1866. The one would reduce the price of wheat one-half, while the other would double the number of pounds constituting a bushel. The one robs just as effectively as the

other; either way, the creditor receives twice as much as is justly due him.

What difference is it to the creditor class whether Congress passes an act doubling the size of the bushel measure, yard stick, pound weight, or number of hours constituting a day's work, and leaves the purchasing power of money as it is, or leaves the weights and measures as they are, but destroys one-half of the volume of money, doubling its purchasing power, so that the creditor class can buy as much for one dollar as they formerly could for two? The only difference between the two acts is, that one would be putting more wheat and corn into the bushel, more cloth in a yard, more cotton, beef, and pork into a pound, and more hours of labor in a day's work, while the other act would be "squeezing" more wheat, more corn, cloth, cotton, beef, pork, or hours of labor into a dollar. An honest dollar is not one which contains one hundred cents' worth of material, but one with a purchasing power neither larger nor smaller when a debt is to be paid than when the debt was made. Between debtor and creditor, every other kind of dollar is a dishonest dollar. It is as honest to have an arbitrary and ever-changing bushel measure, yard stick, or pound weight as it is to have a dollar with an ever-changing purchasing power.

If debts should decrease in the same ratio as the price of products and property decreases, then there would be no loss; but this is not the case. It matters not how much wages and the price of products fall, a debt will not decrease a dollar unless you pay one.

Suppose a farmer borrows \$500 when wheat is worth one dollar per bushel and gives a mortgage on his farm, due in five years from date? Again, suppose that before the mortgage is due, Congress destroys more than one-half of the money volume (as the Contraction act of 1866 has done), and the price of wheat is reduced down to fifty cents per bushel; then the farmer will have to raise two bushels of wheat, do twice the amount of work, when the debt becomes due than when he borrowed the money. By legislation the price of his wheat would be destroyed fifty per cent, and the value of the mortgage would be doubled. The farmer and

his mortgage-holder would travel in opposite directions, and the more the money volume is contracted, the farther apart they are driven, until the sheriff makes final settlement.

The United States Monetary Commission of 1876 said :

A decreasing volume of money and falling prices have been, and are, more fruitful of human misery than war, famine, or pestilence. They have wrought more injustice than all the bad laws ever enacted. . . . The true and only cause of stagnation of industries and commerce, now everywhere felt, is the fact that falling of prices is caused by the shrinking volume of our money. That is the great cause. All others are collateral, cumulative, or really the effect of that one cause.

Senator Ferry, of Michigan, said :

It is easy to see why moneyed men want contraction. The shrinkage then, which others must suffer, would be compensation in their expanded purses. It would be robbing Peter (the people) to pay Paul (the millionaire).

Abraham Lincoln, as published by Mrs. Todd in "Pizarro and John Sherman," page 119, says :

If a government contracted a debt with a certain amount of money in circulation, and then contracted the money volume before the debt was paid, it is the most heinous crime a government could commit against the people.

It is doubtful if Congress ever passed another act which committed such wholesale plundering of the industrial classes as the Contraction act of 1866. Every dollar the creditor and fixed-income classes made, on account of the increased purchasing power of money and the decreased price of property, was money legislated into their pockets and out of the pockets of the people. By legislation, the value of the property of the creditor class was doubled, the rate of interest was doubled, the value of the salaries of all public officials was doubled ; while, on the other hand, the value of the property of the industrial classes was reduced one-half, wages and the price of farm products were reduced one-half, and the ability of the debtor class to pay was reduced one-half.

No person is able to tell how many millions, yes, billions of dollars' worth of property, this law transferred from the debtor to the creditor class. The panic of 1873, with its train of evils, was the legitimate offspring of the Contraction.



tion act of 1866. This panic was created by law, it was legislated upon the people for the benefit of the class who live upon the interest of bonds, notes, and mortgages. It robbed ninety-nine wealth-producers for the benefit of one wealth-absorber.

#### THE CREDIT-STRENGTHENING ACT.

In 1869 Congress passed the Credit-Strengthening act, which changed the contract between the government and the bondholders. When the bonds were issued the bondholders bought them with greenbacks, and they were also payable in the same kind of money, but the act of 1869 changed this contract and made them payable in coin.

First. Congress depreciated the greenbacks by placing two exception clauses on the back of each note.

Second. Then the bondholders bought the bonds with this depreciated currency, worth, on an average, about sixty cents on the dollar.

Third. Then Congress changed the contract and made the bonds payable in coin, thereby legislating forty cents on every dollar's worth of bonds into the pockets of the bondholders and out of the pockets of the people.

Congressman Plumb, of Illinois, in a speech made in the House of Representatives, March 5, 1880, estimated the amount this act of legislation took out of the pockets of the people and put into those of the bondholders, at \$900,000,000. He said :

When the act to strengthen the public credit was passed, there was outstanding, as stated by the then Senator Hendricks, of bonds, the interest of which was payable in coin, and the principal in greenbacks, a total of \$1,600,000,000. The interest on this entire debt, with the exception of \$215,000,000, was at six per cent. At the time of which I am speaking, both bonds and greenbacks were greatly below the par of gold, a discount which, as stated by Senator Davis, amounted in the aggregate to \$900,000,000; that is, if these bonds could be brought up to a par with gold, it would put this vast sum into the pockets of those who held the bonds.

Hon. Thaddeus Stephens said :

We were foolish enough to grant them gold interest, and now they unblushingly demand further advantages; the truth is, we can never satisfy their appetite for money.

Hon. Ben Wade, of Ohio, said :

I am for the laboring portion of our people ; the rich will take care of themselves. . . . We never agreed to pay the five-twenties in gold ; no man can find it in the bond, and I will never consent to have one payment for the bondholder and another for the people. It would sink any party, and it ought to.

Even John Sherman, in a letter dated February 20, 1868, said :

Your idea that we propose to violate or repudiate a promise when we offer to redeem the principal in legal tenders, is erroneous. . . . I think the bondholder violates *his* promise when he refuses to take the same kind of money he paid for the bonds. . . . The bondholder can demand only the kind of money he paid, and he is a repudiator and extortioner to demand money more valuable than he gave.

#### LAND GRANTS.

From 1850 to 1872 Congress donated over 155,000,000 acres of public lands to railway corporations, and, in addition, millions of dollars to assist in their construction in the way of donations by States, counties, cities, and towns.

Mrs. Marion Todd, in "Railways of Europe and America," in which she quoted from the House Miscellaneous Documents of the Public Domain, Vol. 19, pp. 268, 753, says :

If all railroads had complied with the original contracts it would have required 215,000,000 acres of the public domain to satisfy the requirements of the various laws. In 1880 the estimate at the General Land Office was, that it would require 155,514,994 acres ; very nearly 60,000,000 had relapsed or been forfeited to the government. The State of Ohio contains 25,576,960 acres ; this makes the territory of our public lands granted to railroads, six times as great as the State of Ohio — almost an empire itself. November 1st, 1880, the Auditor of Railway Accounts estimated the value of public lands granted railroads at \$391,804,610.

Every dollar these corporations realized out of the sale of these lands, and every dollar donated by States, counties, cities, and towns, was money legislated into their pockets and out of the pockets of the people. There is where the Stanfords, Huntingtons, and hundreds of other millionaires came from. They accumulated millions because the public domain was taken from the people and given to them.

#### DEMONETIZATION OF SILVER.

In 1873 Congress demonetized silver, and it is doubtful if any other act was ever passed by a legislative body so sur-

repeatedly as this one. That act destroyed one-half of our metal money, and increased the demand for gold to double its former amount. This act placed the American farmer at a disadvantage in the markets of the world with the farmers of every free-coinage nation.

Had it not been for the demonetization of silver in the United States it would have been impossible for India to open her wheat market and her cotton fields in competition with us. Think of the disadvantage at which it placed the American wheat- and cotton-grower. The price of a bushel of wheat in the Liverpool market for more than a generation has been one ounce of silver. The values of the two have remained in touch for more than a quarter of a century. Just as the price of silver went up or down, wheat followed. If we single out any one year, say 1892, and find what the demonetization of silver has cost our wheat-growers, we can then make an estimate of what it has cost since 1873. The average London price for silver in 1892 was 87.1 cents per ounce. In that year an Indian farmer could ship a bushel of wheat to Liverpool, receive an ounce of silver for it, take this silver home to the mints in India, have it coined into rupees at the ratio of 15 to 1, worth \$1.37 legal-tender money in India. An American farmer could also ship one bushel of wheat to Liverpool, receive an ounce of silver for it, bring this silver home to the United States, and sell it for whatever he could get, which averaged about 86 cents per ounce. Thus, the Indian farmer realized \$1.37 for his bushel of wheat delivered at Liverpool, while the American farmer got but eighty-six cents, a difference to the disadvantage of the American farmer of fifty-one cents per bushel. But suppose we should have had free coinage of silver in the United States in 1892, at the ratio of 16 to 1, what then would have been the price of wheat in that year? Then an American wheat-grower could have taken a bushel of wheat to Liverpool, received his ounce of silver for it, brought this silver home, taken it to the mint, and have had it coined into standard dollars worth \$1.29 per ounce.

Thus with free coinage of silver, as advocated by the People's Party, the American farmer would have received \$1.29

per bushel for his wheat delivered at Liverpool, where he only received eighty-six cents, a difference of forty-three cents per bushel. The same is true of cotton or any other of our exports which comes in competition with the products of free-coinage nations.

Sir Moreton Frewen, in his remarks before the silver convention held in Washington, D. C., 1892, said :

The price of wheat in this country is its price in London or Liverpool, less the cost of carriage from here there; and the London price of wheat is, under ordinary conditions, one ounce of silver per bushel of wheat. Your farmers will always have to sell a bushel of wheat, say in Chicago, for an ounce of silver, less freight charges to London. If, then, silver is worth \$1.29 per ounce, the London price of American wheat is \$1.29; while if silver is worth ninety cents, then your wheat will realize only ninety cents. This is a statement that will bear close examination, and it is the sum of the importance of the silver question to your nation.

When in Punjab, three years ago, I went very closely into the cost of producing wheat there. In that one Indian province the area devoted to wheat-growing is twice that of the wheat area of Great Britain.

Let us stop and think, for a moment, what the crime of 1873 has cost the American farmer. The loss sustained by the cotton-planter and wheat-grower for seventeen years from 1873 to 1889, as given by Senator Jones, of Nevada, in a speech delivered May 12th and 13th, 1890, was as follows :

According to the figures given by the Bureau of Statistics the average price received each year of the seventeen was 13.1 cents per pound. 2,500,000,000 pounds, at 13.1 cents per pound, equal \$327,000,000, showing a difference of \$83,000,000; that being the average for each separate year for seventeen years, or a total for the entire period of \$1,411,000,000, which represents the loss in debt- and tax-paying power suffered by the cotton-planters by reason of the demonetization of silver. . . . A like computation with regard to wheat will show a loss in debt-paying and tax-paying power of not less than \$100,000,000 a year to the farmers of the North and West by reason of the demonetization of silver—a total of \$1,700,000,000 in the article of wheat alone in seventeen years. . . . Thus a loss, wholly unnecessary, of more than \$3,000,000,000 in debt-paying and tax-paying power is shown to have been inflicted on the farmers and cotton-planters of this country.

Again, in his speech delivered during the extra session of Congress in 1893, Senator Jones further stated that the loss sustained by the wheat- and cotton-growers of this country for the eight years preceding 1893, averaged, for wheat, \$200,000,000 and, for cotton, \$100,000,000 per year, making

a total loss of \$1,200,000,000 for the four years following 1889. If we add to this amount the \$3,000,000,000 loss sustained for the seventeen years previous to 1889, we have the enormous sum of \$4,200,000,000 which the demonetization of silver has cost the American farmer on wheat and cotton only. Our Congress has for twenty years used the silver taken out of the American mines as a club to drive the American wheat and cotton out of the market of the world. It seems almost impossible that the American farmers, intelligent and enterprising as they are, would go to the polls for twenty years and vote for men and parties who have annually legislated over \$250,000,000 out of their pockets. Suppose Congress should pass an act declaring that all the wheat grown in the United States should be sold for forty cents less per bushel in the Liverpool market than the wheat grown in India? Does anyone believe that a law of that sort could be enforced? No. It could not stand thirty days. But this is exactly what Congress has done by closing the mints of the United States against the white metal.

These are some of the laws that have created the two extremes in our society, "the tramp and the millionaire." Our country has a territory large enough to furnish homes for five times our present population, with mines rich enough to furnish the useful metals for the inhabitants of the globe, and with productive capacity and inventive genius beyond any other nation on earth. Yet, in spite of all these wonderful resources, a majority of our population are homeless, and one per cent of the families own more property than the other ninety-nine per cent.

This concentration of wealth, which has been going on for thirty-five years, can be directly traced to legislation. The immense fortunes that have been accumulated are the result of a system of class laws. Four times out of five, when you see or read of a millionaire, you are safe in saying, "There is a man who has accumulated wealth because Congress has legislated it into his pockets;" and four times out of five, when you see a mortgaged farm, a tenant farmer who once owned the soil he cultivates, and a homeless laborer, you are

safe in saying, "There is a man who has met with adversity because Congress has legislated the wealth he created out of his pockets for the benefit of the millionaire." Our government, like a huge threshing machine, has turned out the grain to the few, and the chaff and straw to the many. Class law is the reason why honest hands wither and honest hearts break as the gaunt spectre of starvation hovers over the hovels of the poor. Unjust legislation is responsible for the condition of many of those who produce and yet go hungry, of many of those who make clothes but go ragged, and of many of those who build palaces but are homeless.

William Barry, in the *Forum* for April, 1889, in speaking of European conditions, used the following language:

The agrarian difficulties of Russia, France, Italy, Ireland, and wealthy England show that ere long the urban and rural populations will be standing in the same camp. They will be demanding the abolition of the great and scandalous paradox whereby, though the power of production has increased three or four times as much as the mouths it should fill, those mouths are empty; the backs it should clothe are naked; the heads it should shelter are homeless; the brains it should feed, dull or criminal; and the souls it should help to save, brutish. Surely it is time that science, morality, and religion should speak out. A great change is coming. It is even now at your doors. Ought not men of good will consider how they shall receive it, so that its coming may be peaceable?

Noah Webster, more than a century ago, said: "An equal distribution of property is the foundation of the Republic." Daniel Webster, upon this point, remarked: "Liberty cannot long endure in a country where the tendency is to concentrate wealth in the hands of a few."

The Cincinnati *Enquirer*, during the campaign of 1896, published the following quotation from Chauncey M. Depew, and commented on the same as follows:

Mr. Depew, of New York, has a national reputation as a scholar, an orator, and Republican politician. He never speaks without knowing or believing what he says to be true. In a recent interview by the *Inter-Ocean*, he said: "There are fifty men in New York who can in twenty-four hours stop every wheel on all railroads, close every door of all our manufactories, lock every switch on every telegraph line, and shut down every coal and iron mine in the United States. They can do so because they control the money which this country produces."

If this is true, and we have no evidence that the statement is false, how lamentable and deplorable is the condition of 70,000,000 people! There can be no doubt that whoever controls a country's money controls its



industries and commerce, whether the number be fifty or as many millions. What a travesty on the declaration that this is a government of the people, by the people, for the people, when fifty men in the nation's metropolis can make beggars and slaves of 70,000,000 of people in twenty-four hours! It is no marvel that the patriot Lincoln, in anticipation of the possibility of such a final result, should have had greater anxiety for the safety of his country than during the darkest hour of the civil war. The *Enquirer* asks, with earnestness and sincerity, if it is not time that the people were more interested in the supreme issue of the hour? . . .

We have no roster of the names of the fifty New Yorkers who hold in their hands the destiny of the millions, but we can state with much assurance that there is not a silver-money man in the list. This single fact ought to arouse every voter.

Every friend of a people's government ought to realize that the question to be decided at the polls in November is not whether a Republican or Democratic President and Congress shall enact and administer laws. The perpetuity of the government is in peril. Are the masses of the people capable of self-government? The control of the money, Depew truthfully says, clothes its possessors with absolute power over a country's industries. . . . There is something radically wrong in the administration of any government when fifty men are permitted to exercise control over the industries and commerce of 70,000,000 of people. The common voter is not anxious to consult the wishes or ask the consent of any foreign power before determining the financial status of his own country.

The demonetization of silver, one-half of the constitutional money of the United States, was accomplished by a conspiracy composed of foreign syndicates and our national bankers. The conspiracy has been sufficiently successful to clothe fifty men with absolute power over the industries. . . . The scheme of the conspirators embraces the entire subjugation of the masses to the money power. . . . Never in the history of the world has there been an example of such rapid creation of wealth, and such wonderful absorption in the hands of the few.

The sad experience of other nations as to the baneful effects of the concentration of wealth is before us. Will the American people heed the warning ere it is too late, or will history repeat itself in the twentieth century and in this fair land, as it has done in other ages and nations? The same cause which produced the French Revolution and the downfall of Rome and other nations of antiquity is also undermining our society and institutions to-day. We shall reap what we sow, as they did. We cannot shift the responsibility or escape the consequences by ignoring the impending danger.

#### WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

At last we come to the question, "Who is responsible for these conditions?" To this question there is but one an-

swer: The voters are responsible for all. Our laws depend upon how we vote, just as the shadow on the wall depends upon the object standing before the light. *Voting is like farming. We reap exactly what we sow*, and to-day we are reaping the follies and mistakes sown ten, fifteen, and twenty years ago. If we have bad laws and dishonest officeholders, who is to blame? Our politicians? Partly, yes; but the most blame must fall upon the voters, who are clothed with almost supreme power to protect their interests at the ballot-box. If they do not use this power to their own advantage, they have no one but themselves to blame. Before we can have good and just laws, we must have good and honest law-makers; and before we can have good and honest lawmakers, we must have wise and patriotic voters. We shall never have a change in our laws until we make a change in our voting. That must come first; and if the people cannot do this, they ought not to complain or expect relief. At the ballot-box they voted this system of class laws upon themselves, and there also is the only place they can vote it off. Through legislation we received the laws which oppress; and through legislation alone can they be repealed in a peaceable way. And I, for one, will say that, so long as we have a free ballot, no one has the right to think of settling this question in any other way or at any other place than the ballot-box. Because, if a good citizen violates a bad law, it always encourages a bad citizen to violate a good law; and it is a thousand times, nay, a million times better to prevent a crime than to punish one.

Just as self-preservation is the first law of nature, so the protection of our interests, our welfare, at the ballot-box is the first duty of the voter. It is not enough that we think right or talk right; we must act right and vote right. One vote will do more toward shaping the laws of our country than a hundred resolutions or a thousand petitions.

The Knights of Labor and Trade Unions have for twenty years petitioned Congress and State legislatures to abolish the convict-labor system, and what have they accomplished? Nothing but to see their own free labor reduced nearer to the convict system every year. Had they despoited their

petitions in the ballot-box in the form of a ballot, this system would have vanished long ago. It is high time that the wealth-producers awake to the situation which surrounds them, and cease to be the tools of others' profit and the creatures of others' pleasure.

If the majority of the voters in our country are not interested enough in their own welfare to throw their party prejudices aside for a common cause, then it is only a question of time until our republic will be lost. If the farmer, the miner, the artisan, and all wealth-producing classes cannot stand united and banded together at the ballot-box for their own good, then we shall prove to the world that we, as a people, are no more capable of preserving our liberties and institutions with the ballot than the people of the older nations were without the ballot. But I believe that, when this conflict between organized capital and the wealth-creators comes squarely before the people to be decided at the polls, as come it must; when the storms now low down on the horizon meet, and our political sky is overcast with clouds, then I believe that the people will rise in their majesty, as they have risen in the past, and be wise enough to know their rights, heroic enough to conquer them, and generous enough to extend them to others.

## THE RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC OVER QUASI-PUBLIC SERVICES.

BY HON. WALTER CLARK,

*Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina.*

THE right of the public to regulate the charges of common carriers and of all others discharging public or quasi-public duties is one of transcendent importance, yet the subject is one upon which many practising lawyers even are sometimes not as well informed as they might be, because in its present proportions it is of comparatively recent development, and cases involving it have been rarely tried as yet at the bar of the courts of some of the States, though the subject is on trial at the greater bar of public opinion. It is a matter, too, upon which every citizen, be he lawyer or layman, should be thoroughly informed as to his rights and the rights of the public. The decisions on the subject by the Supreme Court of the Union have been quite uniform, and have so thoroughly illuminated and settled the whole matter that it can be discussed with small reference to the decisions of other tribunals.

The right of the public to regulate the charges of common carriers, even in times when the public granted no franchises and conferred no right of eminent domain, is far older than the common law, older even than the civil law, and was recognized by both as a necessary and an unquestioned rule. Twenty-one years ago, in 1876, the Supreme Court of the United States was first called upon pointedly to review and reaffirm the recognized law of the ages, that the sovereign possessed the right to regulate the charges for services rendered in a public employment or for the use of property affected with a public interest. The particular instance was the constitutionality of an act of the General Assembly of Illinois regulating the charges of warehouses for the storage of grain. It was contended that, unlike railroads and telegraph companies, the public had conferred no franchise by

an act of incorporation, and had not used the right of eminent domain to take private property for their use, and hence that the right to regulate warehouse rates was not to be placed on the same footing as the unquestioned public right to regulate the charges of common carriers. The underlying principle, however, was held to be broad enough to embrace the public right to fix and control the charges of grain warehouses. Though the pressure of immense interests was brought to bear to swerve the court from the well-beaten track by the aid of the ablest and most skilful members of the bar, it firmly held to the principles which have always been law among Anglo-Saxon people. The court laid down the following principles, to which, with one slight deviation, it has ever since adhered:

1. Under the powers inherent in every sovereignty, a government may regulate the conduct of its citizens towards each other, and, when necessary for the public good, the manner in which each shall use his own property.

2. It has, in the exercise of these powers, been customary in England from time immemorial, and in this country from the first colonization, to regulate ferries, common carriers, hackmen, bakers, millers, wharfingers, auctioneers, innkeepers, and many other matters of like quality, and in so doing to fix a maximum charge to be made for services rendered, accommodations furnished, and articles sold.

3. The 14th Amendment to the U. S. Constitution does not in anywise amend the law in this particular.

4. When the owner of property devotes it to a use in which the public has an interest, he in effect grants to the public an interest in such use, and must to the extent of that interest submit to be controlled by the public.

5. The limitation by legislative enactment of the rate of charges for services rendered in an employment of a public nature, or for the use of property in which the public has an interest, establishes no new principle in the law, but only gives a new effect to an old one.

The opinion was rendered by Chief Justice Waite, and is a very able and elaborate one. Only two Judges out of the nine upon that court (United States Supreme Court) dissented from any part of the opinion. It is doubtful if a more important one has been delivered by that court in recent years than this negative which it then and there put upon the attempt to reverse the immemorial law that the public have the right to regulate charges in all matters affected with a public use. The court pointed out that the celebrated Chief

Justice Sir Matthew Hale, centuries ago, had laid it down in his treatise, "*De Jure Maris*," that the sovereign could regulate the conduct and tolls of public ferries; and in his treatise "*De Portibus Maris*," had laid down the same as the rule of the common law as to wharves and wharfingers and as to all other property and vocations "affected by a public interest"; and also cited many English and American decisions recognizing this to be a true statement of the well-settled "law of the land." The court in that case well said that in all such matters,

The controlling fact is the power to regulate at all. If that exists, the right to establish the maximum of charge as one of the means of regulation, is implied. In fact the common-law rule, which requires the charge to be reasonable, is itself a regulation as to price. Without it the owner could make his rates at will, and compel the public to yield to his terms or forego the use. . . . To limit the rate of charges of services rendered in a public employment, or for the use of property in which the public has an interest, is only changing a regulation which existed before.

Therefore the court declared that it is not "a taking of property without due process of law." The court then further said:

We know that this is a power which may be abused, but that is no argument against its existence. For protection against abuses by legislatures, the people must resort to the polls, not to the courts.

This is a very plain and straightforward declaration of the immemorial law; and if that court, under tremendous pressure, has since intimated that the courts might supervise legislative action if the rates should ever be such as to destroy the value of property, it has never infringed upon its declaration, that the people, through its representatives in the law-making body, could prescribe rates; and the court in fact has never ventured to set aside the legislative rates as unreasonable in a single case ever brought before it, nor has it fixed the precise line at which it would assume to intervene.

By all the decisions the right to fix rates being not a judicial but a legislative power, to be exercised by the legislature itself or through a commission created by it, it logically follows that, as the court said in this case, and reaffirmed in *Budd vs. New York*, 143 U. S. 516, the remedy for a harsh exercise of the power (if it should ever happen) is a recourse to the people at the ballot box, not to the courts. For an



unwise or oppressive use of its powers, the legislature is not subject to the supervision of the judiciary, which is merely a coördinate branch of the government. It is only when the legislature does an act—whether wisely or unwisely—which is not within the scope of its powers, that the courts can declare it unconstitutional.

In this same case (*Munn vs. Illinois*) the court further held that the provision in the 14th Amendment, that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws," has no application, for "certainly," it says, "it cannot be claimed that this prevents the State from regulating the fares of hackmen or the charges of draymen in Chicago unless it does the same thing in every other place in its jurisdiction." This rule has since been reiterated in *Dow vs. Beidelman*, 125 U. S. 680.

Some time has been given to the consideration of *Munn vs. Illinois*, as it is the leading case, in which the force of great combinations of capital was brought to bear to remove the ancient landmarks which protected the people from excessive and unreasonable charges. No case has been more often cited since and approved. If at common law the public had a right to regulate the charges of stage lines, grist mills, bakers, chimney-sweeps, innkeepers, and the like, as to whom the public conferred no franchises, for an overwhelming reason it must possess that right as to the modern carriers by rail, whose companies receive their existence from the public will and have the breath of life breathed into them by legislative act. Beyond that, railroad corporations are vested with the power of eminent domain, since power is given to them to take possession of the lands of others, against their will, in order to build their tracks. This could only be done if these corporations are created for the public benefit, since the Constitution forbids private property to be taken "except for public uses."

In the very next case to *Munn vs. Illinois*, the Supreme Court of the United States held (*Chicago R. R. vs. Iowa*, 94 U. S. 155) that railroads, being common carriers for hire, are "subject to legislative control as to their rates of fare and freight," and that the State not having exercised

the right for a long series of years made no difference, for a government could lose none of its powers by non-user; and, further, that it did not "affect the case that before the legislature had fixed the maximum rate the company had pledged its income as security for debt and had leased its road to a tenant who paid a higher rent because the rates had not been reduced by legislative enactment, since the company held its franchise subject to the legislative power to regulate rates, and it could not convey either to its mortgagee or its lessee greater rights than it had itself." The opinion in this case also was written by the Chief Justice. The same decision (cited and approved since in *Ruggles vs. R. Co.* 108 U. S. 526, and *R. Co. vs. Illinois*, 108 U. S. 541, and in other cases) sustained the power of the legislature to classify railroads according to the amount of business done, and to prescribe "a maximum of rates for each of the classes," the court saying that a uniform rate for all railroads in the State might possibly operate unjustly, and that at any rate it was in the discretion of the general assembly to classify the roads and fix different rates. In fact, in the latest case, *Covington vs. Sanford*, 164 U. S. 578, it was held that it was in the legislative power to prescribe a different rate for each road.

In *Peik vs. Chicago*, 94 U. S. 164, the court held, the Chief Justice again delivering the opinion, that where a railroad was chartered by two or more States, each State had nevertheless the right to fix the rates between any two points in its own territory; and further said, quoting *Munn vs. Illinois*, that the legislature and not the courts must say what are reasonable rates, for the legislative rate "binds the courts as well as the people. If it has been improperly fixed, the legislature, not the courts, must be appealed to for the change." And on the next page, *Chicago vs. Ackley*, 94 U. S. 179, the court again held that the maximum fixed by the legislature is binding, and that the railroad company will not be permitted to collect more by showing in the courts that the prescribed rate is unreasonably low.

This has since been reaffirmed in *Budd vs. New York*, 143 U. S. 516, at pp. 546, 547. This question, however, cannot arise as to rates which shall be fixed by the legislature or the

railroad commission in those States in which the legislature in its liberality has provided that, if any common carrier shall deem the rates prescribed too low, the company may appeal to the courts. In the courts a jury of twelve men can pass upon and settle the fact in dispute, whether the rate is reasonable or not. Nothing can be fairer than to submit the question to the same tribunal which settles all disputed issues of fact, when the life, liberty, rights, and property of any citizen are at stake.

The right of the public to regulate rates is not restricted to those services which are essentially monopolies, as railroads and the like, but it applies to all matters which are affected by a public use. This was carefully considered by the Court of Appeals of New York, in *People vs. Budd*, 117 N. Y. 1, in which it was declared that the right of regulation by the public is not restricted to cases in which the owner has a legal monopoly or some special governmental privilege or protection, but extends to all public employments and property. In that case a statute fixing a maximum charge for *grain elevators* was sustained. This decision upon writ of error was affirmed by the Supreme Court of U. S., *Budd vs. N. Y.* 143, U. S. 517; and to the same effect is *Brass vs. North Dakota*, 153 U. S. 391.

The right of regulation applies also to *water companies*, *Spring Valley vs. Schottler*, 110 U. S. 347; and in a recent Texas case the right to regulate the charges of *cotton compresses* is recognized. There are also cases recognizing the right to regulate charges of *tobacco warehouses* and of *warehouses for storing and weighing cotton*, and to regulate services and charges of *general warehousemen*, *Delaware vs. Stock Yard*, 45 N. J. Eq. 50.

The same right of public regulation of rates applies to *street railways*, *Buffalo R. Co. vs. Buffalo*, 111 N. Y. 132; *Sternberg vs. State*, 36 Neb. 307; *Parker vs. Railroad*, 109 Mass. 506; to *canals*, *Perrine vs. Canal Co.*, 9 Howard, U. S., 172; to *ferries*, *Stephens vs. Powell*, 1 Ore. 283; *State vs. Hudson Co.*, 23 N. J. L. 206; *Parker vs. Railroad*, 109 Mass. 506; to *toll roads and bridges*, *Covington vs. Sanford*, 14 Ky. 689; *Ibid*, 164 U. S. 578; *California vs. R. Co.*,

127 U. S. 1; to *wharf charges*, *Onachita vs. Aiken*, 121 U. S. 444; to *telegraph rates*, *Mayo vs. Tel. Co.*, 112 N. C. 343; *R. R. Commission vs. Tel. Co.*, 113 N. C. 213; *Leavell vs. R. Co.*, 116 N. C. 211; *People vs. Budd*, 117 N. Y. 1; *State vs. Edwards*, 86 Me. 105; and to *telephone charges*, although the telephone is covered by a United States patent, *Hockett vs. State*, 105 Ind. 250; *Telephone Co. vs. Bradbury*, 106 Ind. 1; *Johnson vs. State*, 113 Ind. 143; *Telephone Co. vs. State*, 118 Ind. 194 and 598; *Telephone Co. vs. B. & O. Telegraph Co.*, 66 Md. 399.

As to *gas companies* the right of the state to regulate rates either itself or through power conferred upon municipal corporations is beyond controversy, *Toledo vs. Gas Co.*, 5 Ohio St. 557; *State vs. Gas Light Co.*, 34 Ohio St. 572; *Zanesville vs. Gas Light Co.*, 47 Ohio St. 1; *New Memphis vs. Memphis*, 72 Fed. Rep. 952; *Capital City vs. Des Moines*, *Ibid*, 829; *Gas Light Co. vs. Cleveland*, 71 Fed. Rep. 610; *State vs. Laclede*, 102 Mo. 472; *Foster vs. Findlay*, 5 Ohio C. C. 455; *Manhattan vs. Trust Co.*, 16 U. S. App. 588; *State vs. Cincinnati*, 18 Ohio St. 262. The power to regulate *water rates* has already been cited as decided in *Spring Valley vs. Schottler*, 110 U. S. 347; and the right to authorize municipal bodies to regulate the price, weight, and quality of *bread* is declared upon the precedents to be settled law, *Mobile vs. Yuille*, 3 Ala. 137; *Munn vs. People*, 69 Ill. 80.

The power to regulate the tolls of *public mills* is declared, citing many precedents, in *State vs. Edwards*, 86 Me. 102; *West vs. Rawson*, 40 W. Va. 480; also the power to fix the rates for the *salvage of logs*, *West Branch vs. Fisher*, 150 Pa. 475; *Père Marquette vs. Adams*, 44 Mich. 403; *Underwood vs. Pelican Boom Co.*, 76 Wis. 76.

The above are but a few of the cases recognizing the inherent public right to regulate those matters, and there are still many other matters recognized as subject to public regulation.

It must not be forgotten that there is a broad distinction in the law, running through all the ages, between the above and similar vocations "affected with a public interest," as to

which the sovereign or the public has the right to regulate and fix rates, and purely private matters, as farming, selling merchandise, manufacturing, and similar matters, which are purely private in their nature, and as to which the public has never claimed or exercised the right of regulation. It is by ignorance or an affected ignorance of this broad distinction in the law, and which is based on the essential difference in the nature of things, that denial has been sometimes attempted (by those not lawyers) of the right of public regulation in matters as to which the public have always possessed that right.

From the beginning of these States as Colonies, our statute books have borne provisions regulating the tolls of public mills; and until very recent years the county courts fixed the charges of innkeepers, hotels, and barrooms. The latter regulations have been abandoned of late years, not because the power does not still exist, but because its exercise was no longer required to protect the public, the multiplication of inns and hotels furnishing sufficient protection by reason of competition. The regulation of the tolls of grist mills, ferries, and the like is still exercised.

As to railroads and public carriers, the complete list of decisions uniformly sustaining the public right to fix their charges, both in State and in Federal courts, would fill many pages. Enough have been cited to show that the principle is absolutely settled beyond possibility of question, and anyone can trace up numerous other decisions to that effect if so inclined.

In the great case of *People vs. Budd*, 117 N. Y. 22, the highest court of New York, speaking through Judge Andrews, one of its ablest and purest judges, said:

Society could not safely surrender the power to regulate by law the business of common carriers. Its value has been infinitely increased by the conditions of modern commerce, under which the carrying trade of the country is to a great extent absorbed by corporations; and as a check upon the greed of these consolidated interests the legislative power of regulation is demanded by imperative public interest. The same principle upon which the control of common carriers rests has enabled the state to regulate in the public interest the charges of telephone and telegraph companies, and to make the telephone and telegraph, those important agencies of commerce, subservient to the wants and necessities

of society. These regulations in no way interfere with a rational liberty — liberty regulated by law.

This decision was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

*Delegation of power.* The authority of the legislature to empower a railroad commission to prescribe reasonable rates for common carriers is held constitutional in numerous cases, among them *R. R. Commission cases*, 110 U. S. 307; *Reagan vs. Trust Co.*, 154 U. S. 362, 393; *State vs. Chicago*, 38 Minn. 281; *Chicago vs. Dey*, 35 Fed. Rep. 866; *Tilley vs. Savannah*, 4 Woods, 449; *Clyde vs. Railroad*, 57 Fed. Rep. 436; *Chicago vs. Jones*, 149 Ill. 361; *Stone vs. Railroad*, 62 Miss. 602; *Stern vs. Natchez*, 62 Miss. 646; *McWhorter vs. R. Co.* 24 Fla. 417; *Storrs vs. Railroad*, 29 Fla. 617; *State vs. Fremont*, 22 Neb. 313; and in our own State, *Express Co. vs. Railroad*, 111 N. C. 463; and the legislature may prescribe that such rates shall be deemed *prima-facie* reasonable, *State vs. Fremont*, *supra*; *Chicago vs. Dey*, *supra*.

*Judicial Interference.* The right of the courts to interfere with the rates fixed by the lawmaking power was denied in *Munn vs. Ill.*, and several other cases in 94 U. S., and in *Budd vs. N. Y.*, above cited; but in *Reagan vs. Trust Co.*, 104 U. S. 362 and 413, and *St. Louis vs. Gill*, 156 U. S. 649, it has been since declared that the fixing and enforcement of unreasonable and unjust rates for railroads is unconstitutional. But just what rates will be considered unreasonable and unjust has not yet been stated by the United States Supreme Court.

The discussion in the cases just cited, as well as in others, plainly shows a disposition to interfere and condemn legislative rates only when it is clear that their enforcement amounts to a destruction of the value of the property. In *Munn vs. People*, 69 Ill. 80, and *Chicago vs. Dey*, 35 Fed. Rep. 866, it was held that rates fixed by legislative authority that will give some compensation, however small, to the owners of railroad property, cannot be held insufficient by the courts. "This rule leaves large power to the legislature, and would sanction statutes which would cut down railroad dividends to a mere pittance. Yet it is hard to see how any other rule



can be adopted which will not in effect deny the right of the legislature to make regulation of such rates, or else leave little more than the shadow of such power in the legislature, while the real power is assumed by the courts." The effect of the reduced rates on the entire line of road is the correct test, and not that they are unremunerative on a certain part of the line, *St. Louis vs. Gill*, 156 U. S. 649; *Missouri vs. Smith*, 60 Ark. 221.

In *Dow vs. Beidelman*, 125 U. S. 680, it was held that rates which would pay only one and one-half per cent on the original cost of the road were not illegal when the road is held by a reorganized company or its trustees after foreclosure. In *Missouri vs. Smith*, *supra*, it was held that rates sufficient to defray current expenses and repairs, and some profit on the reasonable cost of building the road, could not be interfered with though they were not high enough to pay interest on all its debts, since these might have been incurred through extravagance or mismanagement.

In *Chicago vs. Wellman*, 143 U. S. 339, the act of the legislature of Wisconsin fixing railroad fares at two cents per mile was sustained, the court saying that, "before the court would declare such an act unconstitutional because the rates prevented stockholders receiving any dividend or bondholders any interest, the court must be fully advised as to what was done with the earnings, otherwise by exorbitant or unreasonable salaries or in some other improper way the company might tax the public with unreasonable charges. Unless such things are negatived by proof of reasonable salaries and expenses, or if the record is silent, the legislative rate will be sustained." This is a valuable and noteworthy decision, and no judge dissented from so just a ruling. The same principle is reaffirmed in *Reagan vs. Trust Co.*, 154 U. S. 412.

In the most recent case, *Livingston vs. Sanford*, 164 U. S. 578 (decided December, 1896), the court, while maintaining that ordinarily the rates must not be such as to leave the owners no profit at all, says:

We could not say that the act was unconstitutional because the company (as is alleged and admitted) could not earn more than four per cent

on its capital stock. It cannot be said that a corporation is entitled as of right and without reference to the interest of the public to realize any given per cent on its capital stock. When the question arises whether the legislature has exceeded its constitutional power in prescribing the rates to be charged by a corporation controlling a public highway, stockholders are not the only persons whose rights or interests are to be considered. The rights of the public are not to be ignored.

The court further says that the inquiry as to whether rates are reasonable and just includes whether they are reasonable and just to the public, and adds :

The public cannot properly be subjected to unreasonable rates in order simply that stockholders may earn dividends. . . . If a corporation cannot maintain such a highway and earn dividends for stockholders, it is a misfortune for it and them which the constitution does not require to be remedied by imposing unjust burdens upon the public.

*Charter Exemptions.* In *Stone vs. Farmers' Co.*, 116 U. S. 307 (reversing the Supreme Court of Mississippi), and also in *Stone vs. Ill.*, 116 U. S. 349, it was held that a provision in a railroad charter, that "the company may from time to time fix, regulate, and receive the tolls and charges to be received," did not constitute a contract restricting the State from fixing or reducing charges within the limits of its general power to declare what shall be deemed reasonable rates. So a charter provision giving a railroad company "power to charge such sums for transportation of persons and property as shall seem desirable," or "it shall deem reasonable," does not preclude the legislature from prescribing a maximum of charges which it may make, *Peik vs. Chicago*, 94 U. S. 164; *Chicago vs. Ackley*, *ibid*; *Stone vs. Wis.* 94 U. S. 181; *Chicago vs. Minn.*, 134 U. S. 418; *Ruggles vs. Railroad*, 108 U. S. 526; *Laurel Fork vs. West Va. Co.*, 25 West Va. 324. And this is true though the charter expressly gives the corporation power "to fix its own rates," since this is impliedly subject to legislative power to require them to be reasonable, *Railroad vs. Miller*, 132 U. S. 75; *Ruggles vs. People*, 91 Ill. 256; *Railroad vs. People*, 95 Ill. 313; *Wells vs. Oregon*, 8 Sawy. 600; and the same has been repeatedly held as to gas companies and water companies. A charter giving a railroad a right to fix its rates, if not beyond a rate stated in the charter, is held not a contract, but subject to the legisla-

tive power to fix other reasonable rates as a maximum from time to time as money changes in value or operating costs diminish, *Georgia vs. Smith*, 70 Ga. 694; *Winchester vs. Croxton*, 97 Ky. (1896).

The statutory regulation of the rate to be paid for the use of money is another striking instance of legislative authority to regulate rates. And who would contend that the courts have power to intervene and say the legislative rate is too low?

The Supreme Court of the United States has tersely put the true status of railroads thus: "They are chartered and built for public benefit. The pecuniary profit of their owners is purely incidental." Many railroad owners and managers would reverse this if they could; and as far as they are permitted they act upon the maxim, "Railroads are operated for the benefit of their controllers and managers. The public benefit is purely incidental."

The great hindrance to achieving the public benefit, which is the legal object for which these corporations are created, is the reluctance of their managers to concede reasonable and just rates. Some of them act as if they believed that the occupation of common carriers was a private business, and that they have the right to lay upon the public any rates they think fit to raise money enough to pay whatever salaries they think proper to allow themselves and whatever expenditures they care to make, and interest on three or four times the stock and bonds the property really cost. Yet nothing is farther from the law.

Railroad, telegraph, telephone, and express companies are quasi-public corporations, the charges are in the nature of public taxation, and the public have the right to look into the nature of their expenditures and to fix the rates at a reasonable net profit above economical and necessary disbursements. The public right in this regard is fully shown by the uniform and numerous decisions of the courts above cited. With the enhanced value of money, and the corresponding fall in the prices of farm produce and of labor, there should be a corresponding fall in passenger and freight rates. This would conduce to the public benefit and con-

venience, and would at the same time redound to the benefit of the corporations, which, instead of carrying a few cars half full of passengers or freight, would find it to their benefit as well as to that of the public to reduce their rates and carry two or three times the number of cars with full loads. The present charges in many of the States are an embargo on travel and traffic alike.

This has been amply shown by experience in those States where the public has succeeded in reducing the rates, and by the experience of a line in North Carolina whose receipts nearly doubled during its reduction of rates. Another striking instance is the reduction of postage rates, which has always been followed by enormously increased receipts. Indeed the two-cents-per-mile passenger rate already prescribed in so many States, and which North Carolina is demanding, is admitted by the corporations in that State to be just, since their reports show that their receipts average only  $2\frac{1}{2}$  cents per mile to each passenger. The enormous addition which makes the charge of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents to the public is caused by the immense number of free passes issued to officeholders, large shippers, and other influential people or favorites — the very people who need them least. But the corporations need their influence to keep the public quiet under exorbitant exactions. Thus, in effect, roughly speaking every three passengers who pay  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents per mile for their own travelling are paying also for the free riding of another, for the railroads carry the dead-heads at the expense of the general public.

Governor Pingree of Michigan, who has, I believe, won his fight for three-cent street-car fares and two-cents-per-mile railroad fares, and lower freight rates, in a recent speech in Boston, truthfully said: "Railroad operators are the only men in the country who do not understand that the remedy for short receipts is to lower prices. Yet manufacturers, merchants, and everybody else understand this." Railroad men could understand this too, but that they rely on having a monopoly. In 1874, when the legislature of Wisconsin opened the fight for two-cent fares and lower freight rates, their action was sustained by the Supreme Court of that State, Chief Justice Ryan delivering a remarkably able opin-

ion, in the course of which he said (*Atty. Genl. vs. Railroad*, 35 Wis. 583):

It may well be that the high rates charged by the railroads have lessened their own receipts by crippling the public interests. The affidavits of experts have been read to the contrary, but they are only opinions, founded indeed on past statistics. Such opinions, founded on such statistics, would have defeated cheap postage, and are helping to-day to defeat a moderate tariff. Experience often contradicts such theories. The interest of the public in this regard seems to be identical with that of the railroad. We think that there must be a point where the public interest in railroads and the private interest of the corporators meet, where the service of the public at the lowest practicable rate will produce the largest legitimate income to the railroad. It seems to us an utter delusion that the highest tolls will produce the largest income. The companies have hitherto absolutely controlled their own rates. The legislature now limits them. The companies say the limit is too low. But there is no occasion for heat or passion on either side. The people and the legislature understand well the necessity of railroads to the State and the necessity of dealing fairly and justly and even liberally with the companies.

And the same can be said of the people of all the States. They are a just and sensible people. They understand the necessity and the benefit of railroads. There is no hostility to railroads as such. We want more of them. There is no disposition among any of our people to deal other than liberally with these corporations. There is no desire to fix rates unreasonably low, but we know that in most of the States, if not in all, rates are unreasonably high.

The people of the South and West know that the controlling management of the great railroad systems of those sections has been grasped by non-resident multimillionaires living in London and New York, and that these railroads, which in the eye of the law "were chartered and built for the public benefit, the pecuniary profit of the owners being incidental only," are now run at "the highest the traffic will bear" for the enrichment of non-residents, and with precious little regard to the advantage of the public. We know the enormous salaries paid to its higher officials, who are also provided with sumptuous private palace cars and staffs of servants, private secretaries, lawyers, and newspapers at the public expense. We know that all these expenses come out of the toiling masses, from whom they are collected by the station agents as surely and more rigidly than the taxes are collected

by the sheriffs and collectors for the State and Federal governments. And we know too that the public have full power through their representatives to fix every charge made by every railroad in the Union.

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided in the cases already quoted that the public, in fixing rates, have the right to know the amount of the salaries of railroad officials and the nature of all their disbursements, so that it may be seen how high it is necessary to fix rates. If the expenditures are extravagant, as for high salaries, or illegal, as for lobby expenses or running newspapers, those items may be disregarded. The public have the same right to be informed as to all these matters as in regard to the salaries and expenses of its State government, for it pays them both equally. The railroad managers need to learn that this is no impertinent curiosity, but a matter of legal right, and that railway management and rates are of vital interest to the public, who pay every expenditure and foot every bill the corporations make.

Yet no inquiry has been more jealously resisted by these corporations than examination into the salaries of their higher officials. They know that the investigation would be damning, and they dare not let the people know how much they are taxed for such salaries and for illegal expenses. In North Carolina the salaries on one tolerably short railroad are double those paid by the entire State to the Governor and all the other executive officers of the State government; and the salaries and emoluments of more than one official of corporations operating in that State amount to more than a dozen times what the State pays its Governor; and yet both are paid by the people and come out of their earnings. The same enormous salaries for the chief managers doubtless prevail generally. In 1894, when the pay of railroad employees was reduced and many employees were discharged, the pay of the higher officials was increased to themselves over \$3,000,000.

The public are entitled to regulate the charges of common carriers, as an immemorial right of a free people in all times, and we should accept no petty abatement as a favor. The decisions quoted conclusively show that the public not only



have a right to fix rates, but that in doing so they should justly allow nothing for exorbitant salaries, extravagant expenses, illegal disbursements, nor, after discarding these, anything above the expenses of economical management and a moderate interest on the real value of the property; for the law is just, and does not tolerate dividends on watered stock and bonds.

It could easily be shown that in many of the States the sum illegally wrung from the people above the legal requirements above stated is annually more than the entire amount of taxes levied for the State government. If the men of 1776 are to be commemorated for all time for their resistance to a little illegal tax upon tea, the men who shall hereafter step forward and succeed in rescuing the people from the enormous taxation thus exacted from them, and under which they are staggering without always knowing the reason, will deserve to be remembered "far, far on, in summers that we shall not see."

## PROSPERITY: THE SHAM AND THE REALITY.

BY JOHN CLARK RIDPATH.

FOR four long years a great organized force in America has been engaged in the effort to *make* prosperity.

This organized force cares nothing whatever for prosperity as a fact, but it knows that the prosperity of the nation is one of the conditions upon which its own success and security depend. For this reason it has cried prosperity, prosperity, through all the figures and forms of speech. Since the month of August, 1893, it has turned the combined energies of the greatest power in the world to the one work of creating or forcing into existence what does not exist and cannot be *made* to exist, but what *must* exist if the spoliation of the American people is to continue as heretofore.

The money power, in this undertaking against all natural and healthful conditions to force prosperity where none is, has been wise and cautious. It has had prudence and forethought and cunning; for experience has shown that only the prosperous nation is content to be robbed. He who is already plethoric with plenty will, like a full beef in a reverie, suffer his flank to be picked and flayed without rising from the blue grass to pursue the tormenting thief and toss him-hornwise over the fence. But he who is hungry, he who is on his way to the bread-shop with his last hard-earned quarter, will, if the quarter be taken from him, fight the robber, arrest him—if he can, or kill him—if he must. This is the prime reason why prosperity is a necessity in a country where the robbery of the people has become a fine art.

We may be sure that if prosperity could have been *made*, it would have been made ere now. When the money power undertakes anything and does not succeed, we may know that the impediment is great. If that power be baffled in any scheme, we may assume that nothing short of the immutable laws of nature have stood in the way of its fulfilment. If it be only the trifling laws of God and humanity that stand in

the way they can be altered, amended, or annulled in the interest of "national honor." We may know, therefore, that the money power, baffled for four years in its effort to *make* prosperity where no prosperity is, has been encountered by some law or laws which it has been unable to defy — some principle or force in the nature of things which not even Wall Street, reinforced by the Bank of England, has been powerful enough to overcome. Let us for a moment study the course of that power in its frantic efforts, since the panic fell in the summer of the Columbian year, to restore prosperity by ukase and fulmination.

First, note the fact that the money power is itself the very malevolent agency that struck the economic and industrial life of the United States with fatal paralysis four years ago. The manoeuvres of that power in tampering with our currency, in altering the law of debt payment, in changing every contract, from the purchase of an intercontinental railway down to the purchase of a pin, so that the debt-maker should be forced into bondage under the compulsion of paying with a long dollar worth two for one, — have been the whole and sole cause of the catastrophe. The money upas spread out its baleful branches, and prosperity was mildewed in the shadow. The poisonous dews of that deadly tree distilled upon American enterprise, and it withered and died.

Know all men that prosperity did not fail through any fault of the *people*. The people were not less industrious than before; they were not less frugal; they were not less honest; they were not less friendly to those forms of capital upon which, according to the present conditions of civilization, they are dependent for profitable exertion. The farmers, the mechanics, the miners, the laboring classes in general, the merchants, and all the rank and file of industry, were perfectly blameless as it respects the destruction of prosperity. They had no part or lot in the nefarious business. The American people were just the same in the summer of 1893 that they had been in the summer of 1889. The prostration of their industries, the destruction of their business, the sudden paralysis of their enterprises, the wasting of their small accumulations, the bitter industrial death that came upon them, —

all these were the direct results of the iniquities and devilish schemes that had been contrived by the money power and its abettors to force upon the American people a violated contract, a false economy, a fraudulent financial scheme, and in particular, a long dollar worth more than two for one.

The money power succeeded in the scheme. It contracted the currency. It abolished silver. It got possession of the gold, and then declared that gold was the only honest money — gold and our banknotes, redeemable in greenbacks! Prices ran down to nothing; industry ceased; debt-paying became impossible; for the dollar was cornered. The mortgage of Shylock on about fourteen million voters was foreclosed; the blinds were shut, and the mourners went about the streets. It will prove instructive to note what the money power, with its adjunct missionary organizations, its syndicates, its pools, its trusts, its stock exchanges, its telegraph and railway combinations, its subsidized press, and its extinct systems of political economy has said in explanation and apology for its destruction of prosperity.

In the first place it pleaded *non est factum*. It denied that there had been any failure of prosperity. Every force in the vast working machine of public falsehood was set to work to prove that the people were more prosperous than ever. Whoever said the contrary was a howler of calamity. This was kept up with vile reiteration for a full year; then the tune was changed, and the organs of the International Gold League declared that the lamentable failure of prosperity was due to the producers themselves. The producers were discontented for nothing. They were better paid and had more of the good of life than ever before. They were lazy, boorish hayseeds; if they would go to work and cease talking they would be more prosperous than any people in the world.

Thus began the era of traduction and ridicule. The farmers, the mechanics, the laboring men in general, the miners, the small merchants began to be systematically disparaged. They were caricatured; they were slandered; they were cartooned; they were impersonated by mountebanks on the stage. Every issue of the metropolitan press teemed with aspersions and contumelious jokes cast at the working

classes. Every effort of the producers to lift themselves a little to a higher plane, on which they might share somewhat in the increase and blessedness which honest labor confers on the world, was ridiculed and scorned. Every attempt at coöperation was attacked and misrepresented. Every concrete action of the working men was assailed with covert hatred and open falsehood. Trades-unions were denounced as the inventions of discontent and communism. The capitalistic journals were filled with arguments to show that all combinations of the working people and all expressions of dissatisfaction with their condition were only so many signs of onfalling anarchy, so many impediments to the happiness of the masses. How greatly in those days the metropolitan press was concerned to secure the happiness of the masses by persuading them to be content with the hard but providential lot which had overtaken them!

Another change came over the spirit of the money power's dream. A new form of falsehood was discovered and sent forth. This was "the loss of confidence." Confidence had been destroyed! Capital had lost confidence; perhaps it had lost its own confidence! The stock exchange and the banks had lost confidence. Prosperity, depending upon the stock exchange and the banks, had perished for want of confidence. Restore confidence, and prosperity will return as a flood.

This was the cry of 1894-95. The appendix vermiformis of this delusion was the little gold worm in the vault. The gold worm thought that confidence could come again only with a reform of the currency. Silver being despatched, the greenbacks must be despatched also. We will have a bankers' convention at Baltimore, and will formulate a plan by which American money shall be reduced to two forms only; one metallic and one paper—the one gold and the other national-bank notes. All other forms of money shall be destroyed. Every kind of people's money shall be cancelled and made impossible by law. Make gold (which we own), said they, the *ultimate* money, and paper (which we own also!) the *circulating* money, and *then* prosperity will come in as a flood; for confidence will be restored—that is, *our* confidence will be restored! As for the people, their

confidence is of no account, and never was. Having a national money of the kind described, owned and controlled by ourselves, we can expand it and control it at our will. The government will thus be taken out of the banking business, and the banks will be established in the governing business forever.

Thus will be produced, said the bankers' convention, "an elastic currency" which we can stretch or contract according to the demands of (our own) business! Do this for us, and the country will prosper as never before.

A third change came over the money power's dream. The failure of prosperity was not, after all, the result of Old Hayseed's discontent. It was not, after all, the menace of silver. It was not, after all, the heterogeneous character of our currency, but it was political and financial agitation. The ignorant people were agitating for their rights. They were considering questions for themselves. They were presuming to touch financial conditions. They were disturbing business and alarming the business world. Behold, therefore, how dangerous the American people are to the interests of business!

Prosperity, continued this canting oligarchy, has been driven out of the country by agitation, by comment, by discussion. If the people would cease to talk and would leave the matter to us, we would restore prosperity in a fortnight. If they would prosper let them adopt the motto of Phil Armour, "Make sausages and stop asking fool questions." But the intermeddling people go on disturbing us; they criticise our methods; they vote against us; they doubt our fidelity to their institutions; they actually say that the money power is an ally of monarchy and centralization. They hold meetings and think themselves patriotic when they consider the interests of the country. They should understand that there are no interests except ours. The producing interests are interests only in name. They are interests only to the extent that they furnish the material for our professional practices. The products of industry do not belong to the producers, but to us; and the fine art of getting these products out of the producers' hands into our own is impudently denounced in



popular meetings and by political parties as the nefarious craft of shysters.

The anarchists call our noble art robbery. They call us gamblers. They talk, and write for newspapers, and have orators whom they call patriots, but whom we call demagogues. It is this agitation that keeps business disturbed, and prevents the return of prosperity. A presidential election is coming on, and the anarchists and repudiationists will have a candidate and a party. They will have a platform. That platform and that party are the enemies of prosperity. *We* are the custodians of prosperity; *we* are the promoters of it in the old world and the new. If the party of the anarchists was only suppressed and overthrown, then prosperity would come. Our newspapers shall tell the people that until sound money be declared and vindicated by our platform, and until our party shall be successful, prosperity can never return. And then they added in a whisper aside, "We will not let it return until these ends shall be accomplished; we will lock up the money in our vault and starve them all into submission."

How well we remember the piping metre of this song during the presidential year! Prosperity was held back, said the goldite propaganda, by the Chicago platform; by Mr. Bryan, the demagogue; by his party, the communists. But *we* have a platform which declares for both bimetallicism and gold! It declares for the one or the other according to the preferences of our followers. Our orators and bureaus shall teach it the one way or the other way according to the needs of the neighborhood. The world shall be round or flat to suit the views of the old women of the district!

The silver man can vote *our* platform because it is bimetallic; the gold man can vote it, because it is monometallic. The hybrid can vote it, because it is both. The protectionist can vote it because it is that. The free trader can vote it because it is reciprocal. We have made it so that anybody can vote it, because it is republican. Vote it, therefore, and prosperity will be on the land like the sunshine and the rain. Our candidate is himself the advance agent of prosperity. Follow him, and he will lead you forth.

A majority of the deluded followed him. Prosperity did not return. In the language of Grover Cleveland, "Prosperity still lingered on the threshold." Would she ever cross the threshold and enter? The eloquent and incomparable Bryan has asked this question with humorous sarcasm before hundreds of thousands of our countrymen, and no one has been able to answer. Prosperity did not come with the election of 1896, but continued to hesitate. But no doubt the reason was that the old administration and the old Congress were still in power. Prosperity did not like Cleveland, and refused to cross his threshold! But wait until there shall be a new occupant at the White House; him she will adore; him she will fly to as a fluttering bird to her mate. Wait until the old absurd Congress adjourns, and until the beautiful new Congress comes in; wait until the inauguration, and then prosperity will arrive by the Empire Limited.

But all winter long prosperity stood in the cold outside the lintel. She would not enter until spring. The spring came; the new President was inaugurated and the new Congress assembled; but there was as little prosperity as ever. The incoming of the McKinley administration and the assembling of Congress in extraordinary session had as little effect on the prosperity of the United States as the beating of a tambourine by a Salvationist has on the tides and seasons.

Another proclamation was therefore necessary in order to keep the procession marching and to trammel up the miscarriages of prophecy. The party of prosperity began to be hard pressed for excuses. The dominant faction in that party had declared all along, sometimes with tremendous vociferation and sometimes *sotto voce*, that the failure of prosperity was traceable not to financial, but to economic and commercial reasons. It was the Tariff, and not the Dollar, that had done the mischief. It was the Wilson Bill, and not the abolition of silver money, that had

Brought death into the world, and all our woe,  
With loss of Eden.

Remove the cause, therefore, and Eden will return. So the statesman Dingley comes forth; and the work is undertaken.

Slowly, but with irresistible momentum, the Great Tariff Thing is engendered. For four months the prophetic birth is in gestation, and then —

*Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*

The writer, from the gallery of the House of Representatives on the 26th of July, 1897, had the pleasure of looking down upon that awful birth. It was a prodigious event; for it was to bring prosperity to the United States. The revenues were to be made equal to the expenditures. The follies and absurdities of the Wilson Bill were to be removed. Greatness and genius should now shine forth out of darkness. Cosmos should be instituted, and chaos should flee away. Now at last prosperity should linger no longer. Daintily and at a single bound should coy prosperity now skip the threshold and rush into our arms. Blessed dream! Beautiful chimera! Bitter disappointment!

This article is written on the seventeenth day of August, 1897. What have been the results of the Dingley Bill in the way of restoring prosperity in the United States? Here are the facts. Read them, O you American people! Read them, and reflect upon the long chase of delusion and false cry and mockery that this party of prosperity and Mephistophilian intrigue, this party of double dealing and ambiguity, this party of fraud and feculence has led you. For the first fourteen days of August the receipts of the Treasury of the United States were \$10,163,163. For the same fourteen days the expenditures were \$20,740,000. The deficit is the difference; that is \$10,576,837. At this rate the Dingley Bill will yield the clever deficit of more than \$250,000,000 a year! *That* is the aggregate result of the light that has just failed! *That* is the offspring of the mountain that groaned and travailed! The question is whether the people will still believe in the production of prosperity by the hypodermic of old Doctor Economics at Washington.

The abortive outcome of the Dingley Tariff Bill of 1897 had been for some time foreseen by the goldite oligarchy. Indeed, the issue was foreseen by all intelligent people. At the time of the passage of the bill there were very few who

still hugged the delusion of restoring prosperity by such an idle scheme.

There is a certain measure of patriotic amusement in noting the confusion of the quacks over the production and outcome of their tariff bill. They knew well enough that nothing would come of it; and for this reason they were forced in advance to prepare and proclaim *something else* as a panacea. It was necessary, from a political point of view, to be able to fulminate prosperity coincidently with the passage of the Dingley Bill; else it would appear that the bill was of no avail. For if we administer our drug, though we may know that it is only mucilage and flour, it is still necessary to tell the patient, a few hours afterward, that he is greatly improved!

Knowing, as they did know, that the Dingley Bill would be, from the day of its conception to the day of its delivery and all through life, the economic abortion *par excellence* of the epoch, the management devoted itself in advance to a new method of making prosperity by raising the price of wheat! To do so was a necessity; for otherwise how could the party of prosperity carry the Ohio election? Besides, if the price of wheat could be put *up* coincidently with the collapse of the Dingley Tariff, and if, at the same time, the price of silver could be put *down*, a situation would be prepared, the political value of which no one except a member of the stock exchange could well estimate! For if wheat and silver could be forced apart, *two* great results would be reached, either of which would yield a handsome political return.

In the first place, the argument of the anarchists that wheat and silver go together would be destroyed. If a great gap could be produced, even for a while, in the equation of wheat and silver the Western farmer might be made to stare and wonder at such a fact until he could be induced once more to vote the ticket. If this result could be reached at the precise time when the failure of the tariff legislation should become known and read of all men, then the goldite newspapers and orators could immediately raise a hue and cry in which the high price of wheat and the low price of

silver should be the dominant tone of vociferation, while the collapse of the protection scheme should be the unobserved and omitted note.

In accordance with this programme the makers of prices, with their headquarters in London and Liverpool and New York, began, about the time of the inauguration of McKinley, to mark up wheat and to mark down silver. Steadily they followed this programme. They could do this, for they are the makers of prices. The money lords put themselves between wheat and silver, pushing the first with one hand in one direction, and the second with the other hand in the other direction. Every sensible man knows that the increasing price of wheat during the spring and summer months of 1897 has not been caused by the law of supply and demand, or by any other law known to legitimate political economy. Was there ever a time in the history of the United States when the wheat crop was more abundant? I predict that as many as four States of the Union will show for the season of 1897 an aggregate of more than fifty millions of bushels apiece! In many States such a yield of wheat was never known. From the Missouri river to the Pacific there is a chorus of jubilation over the tremendous crops. I have received private advices from Spokane that the wheat crop throughout Washington is unparalleled — that it will reach from forty to fifty bushels the acre over large stretches of the country.

What, therefore, should be the price of wheat under the law of supply, or any other natural law of the market? What did the goldites themselves tell us about the low price of wheat last year? Oh, *that* was caused by the abundant crops and by the increase of labor-saving machinery. *That* was overproduction. Now the supply is still greater and the labor-saving machinery more abundant. The last year's explanation does not seem to fit the present condition!

The greater the supply, the less the exchangeable value, is one of the first laws of political economy. The present bulge in wheat is, therefore, factitious. The increased demand at home and abroad is by no means as great as the enlarged supply. The equation of supply and demand points clearly

to a price *reduced* from the figures of last year. And yet we have this magnificent spurt, which, thanks be to heaven, will for once accrue to the advantage of the farmers!

The goldbugs have been able to make this price. They were obliged to make it; but the laws of nature are fixed, and it has happened that they were obliged to make it at a time when the benefit must accrue to the producers. This is richness! If one could, in these days, analyze the feelings of one of the cocks of the wheat pit, he would find in the heart of him something bitterer than wormwood arising from the reflection that for once the boom in wheat has come at a time when the benefit must be felt in the farmer's pocket rather than in the day-book of the pit. Hitherto the boom has always been when the wheat was in the hands of the Street.<sup>1</sup>

While this result has been reached in wheat, the very same power that has produced it has forced down the price of silver (as measured by gold) to a figure unprecedented in history. This has been effected at the very time when the diminished output of the silver industry would indicate the opposite result. The silver industry has been paralyzed by the adverse legislation of England, the Continental states, and America. The natural effect of such legislation is clearly to diminish the aggregate output of the silver mines of the world and thereby to reduce the supply. The reduced supply will, of course, point to an increase of exchangeable value; that is, to a rise in the price of silver. It is true that the legislation against silver has diminished the *demand* therefor to such an extent as more than to counterbalance the effect of the reduced output. But this downward force acting on the price of silver has not by any means been equal to the fall in the price. The price has fallen more than the diminished demand would indicate.

The recent reductions in the quotations of silver, there-

---

<sup>1</sup> Since this was written I have learned that a very considerable proportion of the wheat crop of the country was bought in advance at low figures by the speculators, and that the Street is, as a matter of fact, riding on the billow of its own boom! It is the old story over again. To what extent this element of anticipated profit on the part of those who were obliged to make the high price of wheat for political reasons in the summer of 1897 has prevailed to beat the farmers out of *their* profits, it is impossible to say at the present. But if they are not swindled by the wheat gamblers, it will be the first time that they have ever escaped that fate.



fore, have been *made* independently of the law of supply and demand and for the definite purpose of affecting public opinion at this particular juncture of affairs. It has been *made* by the very same power that has bulled the price of wheat. The money oligarchy has shown itself, during the greater part of 1897, in the double act of bull and bear. The beast has become a monster which we will name, not the Minotaur of the fable, but the *Ursataur*, or Bear-bull. Seeing that something must be done to save itself from overthrow by the just wrath of the American people — kindled at last to the flaming point by the long series of delusions, falsehoods, and frauds that have been practised on them — the *Ursataur* has been obliged to invent the scheme of rising wheat and falling silver. For this would enable the minions of that power to make another proclamation of prosperity, and to credit it partly to the Dingley Tariff and partly to the general revival which has been promised for more than a quadrennium.

My countrymen! it is a delusion. It is a political snare. True, you are getting the advantage, for your enemy was this time caught in a trap. The Dingley Bill was a July child; the wheat was still in the hands of the producers. The price had to go up *then*; for the elections were coming in November. I pray you, O farmers, to reap the advantage while you may. Make hay while the sun shines. But do not be foolish enough to trust that enemy when he comes — as he will come — this fall to superintend your voting. If you follow him to the election booth and do his bidding, he will throw you again. As soon as you have deposited your ballot he will go away chuckling, and think what an unmitigated fool Old Hayseed is! With his left eye he will perform a wink at your expense that may be seen from the Chicago wheat pit to Lombard Street. Trust him not, farmer, — unless, indeed, you will enjoy the exercise of being trounced once more on your own board!

Such has been, in outline, the history of prosperity by ukase and fulmination. Such have been the conception and the miscarriage of it. Of this kind of prosperity we should think that the American people have now had a sufficiency. It may well be believed that the citizens of the United States

are not all fools. True, all of them have been fooled some of the time, and some of them have been fooled all the time; but it has never yet happened that all of them have been fooled all the time. A period has now arrived in which it may be hoped that only a few of them can be fooled any of the time. The writer chancies to know something of the sterling good sense of the producers of this country. He has spent the greater part of his life among them, and he has yet to be convinced that they will permit the money power to drag them around through thicket and bramble and quagmire forever. It is time that a throne of judgment should be set in this nation, and that the offenders against the dignity of the nation should be haled to the tribunal.— But I will use the remainder of my space in offering a brief exposition of what real prosperity is, and when it will arrive.

The real prosperity of a nation is the healthful and natural condition of the economic body. It implies a healthful production, a healthful exchange, a healthful distribution, and a healthful consumption of those values which are created by human labor. There must be, we say, a healthful condition throughout the economic body before real prosperity can exist; for prosperity is simply health, and health is prosperity; that is, prosperity is industrial health.

The industries of a nation are all individual in the ultimate analysis. This signifies that the real industries of a people are in the capillaries of the economic body, and not in its centres. If there be an imperfect or obstructed capillary circulation, there can be no health either in the individual or in the nation. If the circulation in the capillaries has ceased for any reason, and the blood and nerve flux have receded toward the centre, there can be no health, no prosperity. There may be blood enough and nerve flux enough; but if these be in the centres instead of the extremities of the economic body, if they circulate around the centres instead of flowing to the extremities, if they tend more and more to heap up on one or two vital organs, there can be — if the trouble be not speedily removed — but one result; that is, congestion and death. We have had in the United States for nearly a quarter of a century a condition of economic

and industrial congestion. This has been attended with symptoms of the oncoming of an apoplectic, or at least a cataleptic, state of all enterprise. Apoplexy signifies death; catalepsy signifies a convulsion, or, in historical language, a revolution.

The capillaries of the industrial body in a nation are fed and stimulated from just two fountains of supply, namely, *the prices of products* and *the wages of labor*. From these two sources spring all the elements of life and strength. When these two sources are full and strong the whole industrial landscape will flush with green and beauty. When these two sources sink away, like receding springs, then the industrial landscape will inevitably become a desert. The whole question simplifies itself around these indisputable conditions. When the prices of products and the wages of labor are adequate, there will be life and warmth in the extremities, and vitality in every organ of the economic body. When prices are low and wages are reduced to a minimum there will be inevitable weakness, stagnation, and lethargy in every part. In a word, and as an epitome of the whole question, prosperity begins in full prices for the products of industry and in strong wages for the whole labor of the people.

Without these primary conditions it is absurd to talk of prosperity or to proclaim it. It is preposterous to talk of its return. While prices remain at half their normal level, and while one moiety of the labor of the country is unemployed and the other moiety is employed for three-fourths of the time at eighty per cent of full wages, there can be no such thing as industrial prosperity or the revival of business anywhere. All the falsehood and proclamation and subsidized shouting that the gold powers of the world can set up and utter will be impotent to revive the currents of paralyzed production, of stagnant exchange, and of hushed manufacture until the fundamental condition of full prices and high wages shall be restored.

The question of the restoration of adequate prices and full wages goes back to the cause or causes of falling prices and low wages. The effect has respect to the cause. What, then, was the unhealthy condition in our economic body that

produced in the first place the falling off of prices and the reduction of wages, with the consequent loss of employment and cessation of industrial enterprise?

The great prime cause of these fatal facts in our industrial life was the disturbance and withdrawal of that natural stimulus which circulates in the channels of industry and constitutes its blood. The stimulus was commercial blood; that is, *money*. A process was instituted by which the circulating force of our system was reduced in quantity and deteriorated in quality. The money which had adjusted itself to the requirements of our economic life twenty-five years ago began to be purposely reduced in volume and diminished in energy by the malign or ignorant powers that were then prevalent in the nation.

A condition of industrial anæmia ensued, in which the capillaries cried out for their wonted stimulus. At the same time the heart and nerve centres, instead of sharing their store, instead of sending it forth into the outlying, starving industries, insisted on a monopoly of whatever force and impetus still existed in the body. The result was the failure and paralysis of our industrial life. Or, to drop the figure, the industries of America, under the false financial system that was craftily instituted in the later seventies and earlier eighties, were weakened and done to death for the want of the normal stimulus, which was to them as the blood and nerve flux of the body are to man.

A true economic life cannot exist, that is, prosperity cannot abound in a nation, when the extremities of the industrial system are benumbed and paralyzed. Under such conditions prosperity cannot be *made* to exist. Indeed, under such conditions, the more quackery, the more disease. When the sensation of numbness and the premonition of paralysis appear, wisdom would indicate the immediate removal of the cause. Unwisdom would indicate more blood-letting and the administration of narcotics. In our case we had full warning. The sensation of numbness was felt and the premonition of paralysis was seen more than twenty years ago. As early as 1874 there was a great preliminary swirl that ought to have given us pause. In 1878 there was another

swish of the oncoming of the evil day. Ever and anon the premonitory rigors of nerve death appeared in this nation, and ever and anon thinkers and patriots pointed out the inevitable coming of disaster, *unless* the malign causes then at work could be stayed. But the dominant powers said that they who pointed out the evil day were birds of ill omen; they were false prophets. They were croakers and ignorant prognosticators of something that would never come. So we journeyed on through dangerous years of muttering until the storm burst — until the residue of our fortunes was well-nigh swept away.

Then the producing industries of the people, far removed from the financial centres, cried out with suffering and anguish. From these primary industries the wave of distress went backward by reflex towards the economic centres of society. Manufactures and the great work of exchange next felt the pressure. Then *they* tottered and fell. The heart of the financial system continued to beat; it was even plethoric with blood. When the extremities complained of anæmia the heart foolishly replied that there had never been so much blood at any time before. As for itself, it was nearly bursting with blood. By and by the heart had to invent a reservoir like Lake Mœris in the Fayum of ancient Egypt in which to pour its surplus of blood. And the name of the lake was BOND!

In plain narrative, the reduction of our currency from a rational to an irrational basis has been the bane of the industrial life of America. With this began the destruction of prosperity. The currency was contracted because of debt, and with a view to increasing the value of that debt. It was done to double the debt and to cut American industry in twain. It was a moneylending scheme, in which the government of the United States at first became a silent partner, and finally the head of the house!

Time was, during the reign of Hugh McCulloch, when the legal-tender circulation of the country was cancelled and destroyed at the rate of ten millions a month! Strange to relate that Wall Street, suddenly pinched at that juncture, became the greatest inflationist that we have ever known.

A committee from the Street, composed of its most powerful representatives, went to Washington and besought the President and Secretary of the Treasury to stop the contraction and to reissue some of the despised greenbacks in order to save the "business interests" from disaster! Gradually, however, the work of contraction was resumed. One measure after another was adopted always with the end in view of increasing the value of the debt, and at the same time reducing the capacity of the debtor. The two things went together, and the paralysis of industry as the inevitable result ensued.

No enterprise which is conducted in whole or in part on credit can, in the nature of the case, be long prosecuted if the debit and credit of the establishment are constantly manipulated so as to increase the one and reduce the other. No business capacity is sufficient to cope with that situation in which with each night following each day of labor and payment the debit account is tampered with so as to make it greater than it was before. And yet this is precisely what has been done in the United States. Our legal tender or people's money has been reduced to a minimum, and that minimum is openly threatened with extinction. The programme for the obliteration of the last greenback is only suspended until the people quiet down. The coinage of legal-tender silver has been interdicted by law. Not only so, but silver dollars are already disparaged to the extent that in the money centres they have been virtually discarded. In New York City there is not a telegraph operative who, in giving you a silver dollar in exchange, will not apologize for the necessity of doing it! To such an extent has the opinion of the metropolis been corrupted and debased that the silver dollar, the old dollar of the law and the contract for all debts, public and private, in the United States, is not accepted, except under compulsion of legal-tender, by the abettors of the stock exchange, and not handled by the messenger boys without a shudder and an apology. This is true in New York, in Boston, in Philadelphia, in every great city east of the Alleghanies and north of the Potomac.

Moreover, it is intended by the money power to destroy



finally our silver-dollar currency. Let no one imagine that the silver dollar will be spared. As soon as the greenbacks are out of the way, the upholders of "the national credit" will turn upon our silver residue of legal tender with all the energy and genius which they possess. They will first use the silver dollars to repair the bucket-chain and to force the sale of additional bonds. At the same time they will denounce the silver dollars, *because they are convertible into a bucket-chain!* Therefore they ought to be sent to the mint and to the silver shops to be recoined into change or converted into the arts.

To resume the argument: Prosperity withered and perished because of the criminal manipulation of the currency system of the United States. Prosperity and the single gold standard of values do not consist; they cannot consist, and they never will consist. The gold standard may be fixed and riveted on the American people; but I do not think it will be! If it should be done, industrial slavery will be the permanent result. If it should be done, prosperity will linger not only on Cleveland's threshold and on McKinley's threshold, but on the threshold of every President to come. If the gold scheme shall be successful in Europe and America, prosperity need not be expected to return. To teach the people this lesson and to burn it into their memories and hearts is the object of this article.

It makes no difference how much a fictitious prosperity may be fulminated through the land. It makes no difference how much it may be declared by ukase and supported with spurious statistics. It makes no difference how much it may be electrified with grapevine despatches telling of impossible conditions, of revivals that exist only in imagination, and of florid reports that are invented in the offices of the mendacious journals that publish them.

Real prosperity will come again when the equilibrium shall be restored in the economic body of this nation. That will be when the prices of products and the wages of labor shall rise to the level of adequate remuneration. It will come when the circulating medium shall be equivalent to the steady and comparatively unchanging demands of pro-

ductive enterprise and commerce. It will come when the metallic basis of currency shall be broadened and confirmed in both metals, silver and gold, on terms of absolute equality. It will come when silver and gold together, at an established ratio, shall be built into all the abutments of our industrial structure. It will come when the monetary system, thus established and constituted, shall send its reviving streams of energy and fertility into the extremities of the economic body. It will come when the capillary circulation shall be reëstablished with a generous glow and vitality in the small individual industries of the American people. It will come when the money congestion of this nation and of all the world shall be relieved; and when the accumulated and locked-up money hoard shall be forced abroad into legitimate and wholesome enterprises. It will come when the people shall have a people's money in their pockets; when interest-bearing debt as the basis of business shall be abolished; when industry shall again be individualized and independent; when Man shall become the owner of the Dollar; and when the manipulation of the Dollar, which is the Man's counter and the index of value in the transaction of his business, by any power whatsoever, whether bank or syndicate or nation, shall be branded and punished as a crime.

## JEFFERSON AND HIS POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

BY MARY PLATT PARMELEE.

AS the great world spins down the ringing grooves of change, there are two things which are always and forever happening. Those that are down are trying to get up, and those on top are striving to keep them down. No defeat, however terrible, discourages these tireless forces. Let the explosion be never so violent, soon as the wreckage is cleared away, the forces at the top commence again to smooth and then to crystallize a surface which shall be impenetrable to the forces below.

Just one century ago, the world had a fearful object-lesson in the explosive power of long imprisoned wrong and suffering. For thirty years the seed dropped by Rousseau had been germinating.

Whether the man makes the times, or the times the man, is one of the questions with which the human mind amuses itself. It reminds one of that very wise person who thought it such a singular and fortunate thing that all the great cities *happened* to be on the banks of large rivers.

He who can capture the unuttered thought of his time, give expression to the vague discontent, definite outline to the aspiration, *he* is the man of the hour. People have vaguely felt it, have groped for it; but *he* has grasped and formulated it—and he is *Great*! It was the times which created Rousseau, not Rousseau the times. He encamped on the banks of a great river. The river did not flow past that point because *he* stood there! Something within him vibrated in response to the unuttered longing of his time, and he materialized the spirit of the hour into a creed and a formula—“*Liberty—Equality—Fraternity.*” To the wretched it meant hope—opportunity—fulfilment. To the jaded appetites of the gay and powerful it meant a fascinating abstraction, a charming theme to discuss in elegant boudoirs; and pastoral simplicity became what we should now call a

fad. So, while the one class daintily sipped the exhilarating wine brewed by the Swiss philosopher, and airily discussed its flavor, the other eagerly swallowed it in great, thirsty, copious draughts, which fired the imagination and awoke passionate longings.

Little did Rousseau dream of all that was enfolded within that germ! Nor did the rich and great respect the potential energy existing in the phrase with which they played as with a new toy, and which, thirty years later, became the watchword for the most terrific outburst of human passion the world had ever beheld. And, when all was over—the unbridled force all expended—what was gained? The very word *Liberty* made men shudder! Gladly they huddled under the strong, sheltering arm of Napoleon. He too had a genius for divining the unuttered thought of his time. He had no passionate longing for his race, but none knew better than he when to encamp upon the banks of a great river! “What this people need is to *forget*—to be *amused*—*diverted*.” The blood and ashes—all reminders of the unspeakable horror of the paroxysm, were covered with a glittering mantle of imperialism, which David and others embroidered with their gold and silver threads of art. And the gay French world danced and sang, happy in light-hearted confidence that the lesson had been sufficient. *Liberty*—*Equality*—*Fraternity*—these ugly words would be heard nevermore.

And Rousseau—poor Rousseau, whose name is ineffaceably written on the title-page of this tragedy—what had he to do with it? He was like one of those theoretic gardeners, who, having studied the properties of seeds in libraries, proceed to plant them, and are then amazed at the forthcoming growth! Was this the sort of plant Rousseau’s prophetic imagination had seen?

I think it was the great Frederick who said that if he had a province to punish, he would give it to philosophers to govern. But it is well for us that at the hour when we took up a separate existence among the peoples of the earth, there were philosophers who moulded the thought and guided the pens which were to secure to us our liberties.

But there are philosophers and philosophers. It is one of those loosely fitting words which will cover a Rousseau and a Voltaire as well as a Franklin and a Jefferson. And while Rousseau and the French philosopher liberated a terrible energy, making no provision for its restraint, the men who presided at the birth of this nation were constructing a system of checks and balances of marvellous perfection, through which the popular will must flow. It was the difference between lightning pursuing its own mad course toward its end, and the same force captured for the beneficent uses of civilization.

A problem entirely new to human experience was before them. Thirteen States, with greatest diversity in size, importance, and characteristics, were to be welded into a nation. A plan of federation must be devised which should give equal opportunity to the smallest with the greatest, and which, while preserving the autonomy of each State, should still bring all into a firmly compacted and indivisible whole.

The story of the war of opinions which raged so fiercely over the cradle of our Republic is simply that of a conflict between two everlasting principles, which, so long as the world stands, will be arrayed against each other—the principles of paternalism and individualism. Thomas Jefferson was an uncompromising champion of *individualism*; the effort of his life was to reduce the powers of the central government to the *minimum*, and to exalt to the maximum the importance of the individual. In a character less nicely balanced, a mind less philosophical, and a heart less simply intent upon the highest good of his country, so strong a tendency might have been dangerous. But Jefferson loved his country more than his theory. He was not a fanatic or an enthusiast, but a man with deep convictions and an unbending purpose.

He commenced life as a loyal subject of Great Britain, but on the very threshold of his career as a lawyer, and while still only a youth, was caught up by the great wave of popular indignation at the wrongs inflicted by the mother country, and from that time was a champion of the rights of America, a leader in her councils, and impressed himself as did no other

man upon the structure of her government and the spirit informing her institutions, which became, if Emerson's definition be true, the "lengthened shadow" of Jefferson.

He had a nature endowed with splendid virtues and a capacious intellect, a mind which was not a storehouse but a laboratory. It assimilated all the facts of human experience and drew from them a political philosophy which was the mainspring of his action, and the endeavor of his life to see embodied in American institutions. His creed was simple. He believed in the *People*. He had an abiding faith in the collective wisdom of *Humanity*. He believed that the ideal government should be framed, not so much to restrain the popular will as to *express* it; not to obstruct, but to *execute* it. The *People* were sovereign; the government was their servant.

Few men have addressed themselves to a task of such magnitude, or brought to it qualities so ample and varied. With a splendid grasp of *principles* he combined a genius for details which rendered him peculiarly fitted to aid in the formative period of the nation.

Matchless as a husband, a father, and a friend, he was besides a scholar, a musician, a writer, an inventor, a man of science, a philosopher; but above and beyond all else he was a *patriot*. And into this great swelling stream of patriotism he poured all other gifts. All that he was and had he gave with unsparing hand. In his mind were the germs of art, science, and philosophy, which with opportunity would have blossomed into a splendid fruitage. But deaf to all these allurements, he devoted fifty years of life to public service with such absolute self-surrender, with private interests so entirely subordinated to public ones, that he saw his own ample fortune waste away from neglect, and died a bankrupt.

Few biographies leave on the mind an impression of nobler character than that of Thomas Jefferson, and yet there has probably never been a man who has excited such antagonisms and been so detested and execrated by good men as he.

I myself was brought up in a family where the traditions were all anti-Jeffersonian. And as I write these eulogistic words I am somewhat in dread lest my honored grandfather



shall arise in indignation and rebuke me. Indeed, until quite recently I believed that *Jefferson* was only another name for incarnate evil; that he was not only guilty of the enormity of having fathered the *Democratic party*, but a man who was blasphemous, vulgar, and in fact quite unfit for the society of self-respecting people. If you will read William Cullen Bryant's vituperative description of him in his first poem, "The Embargo," you will understand the sort of Jeffersonian echoes which are still heard in many households throughout the land. But no Roman was sterner in virtue, no Spartan more severe in ideas of truth and justice. His principles were exalted and *philosophically true*, and his fidelity to them was absolute. In the use of his great gifts, *never* did he seem impelled by small motives or by personal ambitions.

During six terrible years (between 1792 and 1798) he was resident minister at Paris. Poor France was striving to follow in America's footsteps on the path to liberty. To be what we were, think and act as we did, was her aim and ideal.

Fancy Jefferson's amazement and grief when he returned to America after this long absence, and upon taking his place in Washington's cabinet at New York, at finding himself in an atmosphere of openly avowed monarchical sentiment! Republicanism unfashionable! A strong reaction toward aristocratic habits and ideals. An exclusive social surface forming in New York and elsewhere which lacked only titles to render it indistinguishable from a foreign *noblesse*. Do we realize how narrow was the escape made by the young Republic at this time? And do we realize who it was who stood and fought out that battle almost single-handed for the American idea?

Hamilton openly declaring that a limited monarchy was the best form of government, and the one we should without doubt adopt after the present experiment had failed — as it must. John Adams sending forth philosophical diatribes upon the benefits of a landed and privileged aristocracy, and of the hereditary principle. Even Washington investing his office with a sort of regal state, and his person with some of the divinity which doth hedge a king.

Jefferson alone seemed to comprehend American institutions, as experience and time have developed them, and as we behold them to-day. He stands now as the most complete exponent, not of this political party or that, as is claimed, but of *Americanism*.

However he may have gone astray in matters of minor policy, absolute fidelity to one great underlying principle gave consistency and solidity to his whole life and purpose. He believed the source of power in a nation should be the *People*; and everything standing between the popular will and its fulfilment was the object of his determined opposition. Electoral colleges, the election of senators by legislatures, all those breakwaters designed to obstruct or restrain the tide of popular sentiment, he would have swept away, and come as near as possible to the direct expression of the desire of the individuals composing the nation.

If ever man represented an elementary force, that man was Jefferson! He was the intensest expression of that tendency which arrays the unit against the unity which enfolds it; while Hamilton as positively embodied the opposing force.

In the great economy of the universe there is a perpetual balancing of forces. If nature impels an atom to rush madly in a certain direction, there is sure to be near it an opposing tendency whose mission it is to check and deflect, if not to capture it. Near to a Jefferson there is sure to be a Hamilton! Every existing organism, from the suns which circle in their courses, to the smallest flower by the wayside, is in the grasp of these two forces, the one which tends to individualism, and the one which strives to bring the atom into subjection to the whole.

In nature it appears in the guise of the *centripetal* and the *centrifugal*. In government it is *centralism* in conflict with *individualism*. In the early politics of the country it was *Federalism* arrayed against *Republicanism*. In religion it is *ecclesiasticism* at war with *reform*; in society, *conservatism* with *radicalism*; and in individual character it is *straight-stepping respectability* looking with horror at the eccentric beings who despise and defy convention and precedent.

All are manifestations of one and the same thing; and every man and woman who lives is compounded of these

two tendencies in varying proportions. Or if he be an unmixed representation of one or the other, he may be counted as one of the elementary forces, and the chances are that he will be either a very useful or, as is more likely, a very *troublesome* addition to human society or to the body politic.

No one can say that either tendency is absolutely right or wrong. There are times when individualism is needed, and times again when it becomes a destructive force and must be restrained by paternalism; and as this becomes oppressive, as it is sure to do, individualism again asserts itself. So the way of progress seems a swinging of the pendulum back and forth from the one to the other. So long as the world stands there will be one class of men striving to strengthen the defences of enclosing systems, and others just as resolved to break away from the restraints they have outgrown.

Conservatives and radicals are born, not made. Hamilton was by nature an aristocrat. He was an exotic in a republic, brilliant, captivating, of infinite service in organizing our nascent finances and affairs, a born leader of men; but the way he would lead them was always the one way — the way of *centralization*. Everything he said and did or desired had that one object — to increase the power at the centre; but Jefferson just as invariably had for his aim *decentralization*. The policy of the one was based upon the idea that man is essentially bad, and needs the checks and restraints of a strong government; that of the other, that humanity is to be trusted, that our destinies are safer in the hands of the many than in the hands of the privileged few.

Never has there been such a storm of political passion as that which raged between the adherents of these two men, Federalists and Republicans. Stripped of all its minor issues, it was *au fond* the old duel between the *masses* and the *classes*. To the one party, Hamilton was the aristocrat who would reënslave them in a monarchy; to the other, Jefferson represented a monster who would put unrestricted power into the hands of the rabble, a sympathizer with Marat and Robespierre and the guillotine.

In *England* Hamilton saw law, order, stability, strength, dignity. What better could be desired for this land of

his adoption? Whereas Jefferson was anti-British to the very core of his being.

*France*, the object of Hamilton's detestation, was dear to Jefferson; its fortunes were an object of solicitude second only to those of his own country. Bound by ties of gratitude, and still more by a great bond of sympathy with her aspirations, he treated her as we treat those we love. He found excuse for her mistakes. In the frightful experiences through which she was passing he saw retribution for centuries of cruel wrong; and amidst all the tempest of fury and passion he believed in her. One must indeed have been a philosopher and an optimist to have done this at such a time, and Hamilton was neither the one nor the other. To him, as to Burke in England, the French Revolution was an unmitigated horror, which filled him with loathing, and which no *past* could excuse, and no *future* compensate for. The attitude of Jefferson and Hamilton toward England and France was temperamental, the logical outcome of what each man was. Fundamentally different in mind and character, how could they ever view things from the same angle? They were both great. Each performed services for the Republic which cannot be measured. We live every hour under institutions which were in conception and realization Hamilton's, but the life which gives them being is from Jefferson! The one created the *form*, the other the spirit which informs it.

It requires a full century to judge impartially men and events of heroic proportions. Whether Federalism or Republicanism was altogether right or wrong, who shall say even now? But this we can and *do* declare: Jefferson's political philosophy was what was needed at that time, and it is possible we might not have been a republic to-day had he not stood like a rock and barred the way to the path leading toward monarchy.

His advocacy of State sovereignty was a part of his general plan to diminish at every point the powers of the central government, and it bore unhappy fruit a half century later. But can anyone doubt upon which side he would have stood in the War of the Rebellion?

Should any be in doubt whether our Republic has developed upon Hamiltonian or Jeffersonian lines, let him imagine — if he can — a man getting up to-day in the halls of Congress and urging the establishment of the hereditary principle, or saying that a limited monarchy is the model form of government to which all republics must return. If this man *dared* to say these things, would he ever dare to return to his constituents after saying them? Whereas, on the other side, are there not to-day, and *every* day, patriotic speeches, there and everywhere, precisely in accord with the principles it was the effort of Jefferson's life to declare? Are these not the warp and woof of the *American idea* as it is enshrined to-day in the hearts of the people he loved and trusted?

What changes since that time! Vast solitudes peopled, the product of our industries supplying the markets of the world, our internal affairs new, strange, complex, beyond the imagination of those men to conceive! New dangers confront us, new diseases have arisen in the body politic, ingenious methods for enslaving the people have been devised. A hydra-headed paternalism threatens our liberties, but it is the paternalism of mediæval times. We have our coal barons, our sugar kings, our electric imperialism — not one tyrant but fifty! and we are apparently powerless. What is to be done? Shall the government take possession of the great national resources, and administer them for the state?

Patriotic men are divided in opinion. The shade of Jefferson is invoked. "Enlarge the powers of the central government? Create a colossal despotism? Never!" On the other hand men say: "If it were a monarchy, a despotism — no! But *we*, the *people*, are the government. Why should we not take possession of our own, wrest our resources from the hands of the *few*, and administer them in the interest of the *many*?"

To which solution would the Jeffersonian lines of policy lead? What would he advise were he here to-day? The *people*, that great consensus of opinion upon which he so fearlessly relied, has not spoken yet, but it will.

There is something impressive in the wrath of a patient animal. The wildcat in a chronic state of irritation, viciously

snapping at everything, the tiger crouching preparatory to springing upon his victim, are in normal condition. But when the apathetic elephant raises his trunk and gives vent to latent energies in a ponderous roar, we are inclined to believe his indignation is just, that he has been imposed upon past endurance, and we have a reassuring confidence that stern justice will be meted out to *somebody* in a way not to be forgotten. Not a trifling matter of an eye scratched out or a leg torn off, but an overturning which will sweep away the foundations of things.

As a nation we are almost ignominiously patient. The ends of justice are defeated, the will of the people is thwarted, disgraceful methods invade business and politics, until it sometimes seems as if the country were in the hands of highwaymen, and democratic institutions are held up to the scorn and jeers of the nations across the sea. "Are *these* the fruits of your boasted system?" they ask. "Your industries and your natural resources in the grasp of a handful of men, who take the wheat, and throw the chaff to the millions? The machinery of your government captured by another handful, who control its workings as the engineer does his locomotive?"

Stung by the taunt we look about us. We had known that things were going somewhat wrong, but intent upon our pursuits, and with an indolent confidence and lazy optimism, we trusted that *somebody* — or the inherent soundness of the whole — would somehow set things right. But this is terrible! We feel as do the people on a train who awaken from pleasant dreams to find themselves in the hands of robbers. We are indeed enmeshed on every side. All the currents of trade setting toward those thirsty maelstroms which are drawing the substance of the land into their bottomless pits; and our boasted government "of the People, for the People, by the People," — what is there left of it when between the will of the people and the end desired there stands an ingenious mechanism for converting it into the will of a few men, who in turn express the will of the *one* Supreme Conspirator? Europe smiles. Republicanism is a failure. Democratic institutions are a flimsy substitute for strong government. Is it true? The faint-hearted lose courage. Then



it was a phantom. This too will go the way of other failures in self-government, unable to stand the test of time and the strain of circumstance !

But I have an abiding faith in the cumulative energies which some overt act will one day set free, which will sweep away in a tremendous outburst, not this hungry monopoly, or that opportunity for stifling the will of the people at the polls, but the whole system and *systems* which make it *possible* to impose such gigantic wrongs upon us. And I believe this because of an unshaken confidence in *democratic institutions*, because of my faith in the *people*, and because of an abiding faith in that charter of our liberties framed with such ingenious wisdom, such marvellous power of adaptability to changing conditions, so inflexible and yet so elastic, that it seems almost the result of inspiration ! "A government of the People, for the People, by the People" — the words are few and simple, yet they are, I will not say *the* most, but *among* the most important ever uttered, and are inscribed upon the door which opened toward the emancipation, not of a handful of colonists, but of the entire world ! Not a protest against taxation without representation, but the declaration of one of the great principles upon which the universe moves, and which brings the atom into vital and organic relation with the mass. Will it be thought transcendental if I say that, when the divine economy of this great universe is more fully comprehended, we shall find that the democratic principle is deeply rooted in the eternal nature of things, and that the relation of the individual to the whole, and of the whole again to the individual, as conceived by the framers of our Constitution, is ideally true, and that the marvellous development of this republic has been because we were fundamentally in harmony with eternal principles, and keeping step with the universe ?

We live in retrospective times. At the close of a century of national life, and of four centuries of continental life, we stop to take observation. Where are we ? Whither are we tending ? What does it all mean ? Has it any meaning at all ? Have we been weaving any pattern on the loom of time, or are the lines only fragmentary and disconnected ?

Are we drifting at random, the sport of great forces, tossed like a shuttlecock from one to another? If so, then creation is a colossal cheat, and the God of our hope is a phantom!

Was it by chance that long, long ago a path emerged from the darkness of oppression, that it grew into a road, and then a highway, upon whose gates the Anglo-Saxon inscribed *Magna Charta*, another *Habeas Corpus*, and still another *Trial by Jury*? Did it only *happen* that this expanding highway in time reappeared across the sea? Was it a fortuitous thing that men of exceptional purity, and imbued with Anglo-Saxon traditions, planted aspirations toward *Liberty* on a virgin continent? And was it an *accident* that Franklin and Jefferson stood at the threshold of our existence as a republic, and marked out a path for the feet of the nation to tread?

The ways have grown devious and entangling, but let no one so much as *breathe* the word *Failure*! To expect it is to invite it.

This continent has been supremely honored. It is the home of the greatest experiment ever tried by the human race. If Jefferson's political philosophy was right, then we are right. If a government "of the People, for the People, by the People" prove strong enough and at the same time sufficiently elastic to bear the expanding life of a great nation, then the days of political despotism are numbered, and in the ages to come crowns and thrones will be known only as curious relics.

## THE LATEST SOCIAL VISION.

BY B. O. FLOWER.

### I.

THE first century of modern times gave birth to "Utopia." It appeared at a moment when thought along all lines of research was in a state of rapid flux, when revolution was written over all doorways from which the human mind looked forth. Feudalistic anarchy was giving place to centralized government. The new learning, no less than the abuses of the Church, made the Reformation inevitable. A new world had been discovered, and the marvellous tales brought home by Spanish mariners eclipsed the wonder stories told by the Portuguese who returned from India. The ships of Magellan had circumnavigated the globe, Gutenberg's press was sowing the world with knowledge, Copernicus was questioning the stars, and Machiavelli, that child of the night, was engaged in a work which should instill poison into the minds of the powerful.

As "The Prince" of Machiavelli typified triumphant animalism, or the victory of the beast over the god in social life, the "Utopia" of Sir Thomas More represented the supremacy of altruism over egoism. It fronted the dawn and spoke of the coming day, when humanity should be worthy of the glorious old earth because civilization should rest on justice and be made luminous with wisdom and love. Man was not then ready to spell the great word Fraternity. But a truth once uttered lives forever. The prophet's voice and the hero's deeds never cease to inspire humanity, and the wonderful vision of the English philosopher has proved a veritable pillar of fire during the long night of force and fraud, of strife and struggle that have marked the past four hundred years.

Now, however, we are in the springtime of another period of awakening and advance. Again we find the world's thought in a state of flux. Change is written over all portals. A larger vision of earth and heaven than the brain

of the people was capable of conceiving at any previous period is dawning upon humanity. The anarchy of feudalism gave place to the more orderly rule of centralized government, and on the heels of centralization came representative government, with face set toward true democracy. We have witnessed the age of muscle giving place to the age of brain, and that, in turn, is about to yield to the age of heart. The body has bowed to the mind, and both are about to yield to the spirit. Not that the supremacy of soul or heart means a diminution of brawn or brain—the shriveling of body or the dwarfing of mind; on the contrary, it means that the expansion of the soul will favor the grandest development of physical and mental powers; a development possible only when man's nature is warmed and enthused by divine love for all, instead of being consumed with thought and love of self.

## II.

The activity of thinkers, the spectacle of the printing-press blossoming with pamphlets of protest, the profound discontent of the masses, the restlessness of the world, are all significant signs of a change. But perhaps nothing is so suggestive, and certainly nothing illustrates so clearly the trend of popular thought along social and economic lines, as the character of the really great and popular social visions which have enriched our literature during the past two decades. "Looking Backward," by Edward Bellamy, "News from Nowhere" and "A Dream of John Ball," by William Morris, "The City Beautiful," by Joaquin Miller, "A Traveller from Altruria," by William Dean Howells, and "Equality," by Edward Bellamy, are works which challenge special notice because of the profound impression they are making upon the public mind, no less than the broad grasp of fundamental social problems displayed and the bold and eminently unconventional point of view from which the authors write.

The latest social vision is in many respects the most complete and noteworthy picture of social democracy which has appeared. In "Equality" Mr. Bellamy has elucidated the new political economy of socialism under the guise of fiction

and in a popular yet clear and comprehensive manner. Coming at a time like the present, when the drift of thought is setting so strongly along socialistic lines, this volume will prove far-reaching in its influence upon the people. It contains a message for all earnest men and women, be they in sympathy with socialism or not.

In writing of this volume it will be my purpose to briefly outline the principal ideas advanced, and reflect as well as may be the spirit of the work. Though interwoven throughout the various chapters as woof and warp of a single fabric, the thought of equality logically separates into two divisions, which stand over against each other in bold antithesis. The indictment of our civilization, or the arraignment of private capitalism before the bar of contemporary opinion, forms one of the most thought-compelling contributions to popular modern economic literature; while the elucidation of the socialistic theory in the picture of twentieth-century civilization under the law of equal freedom amid a wider liberty than man has ever known, and with poverty and the fear of the wolf forever vanished, is rich in suggestiveness for all thinking men and women of whatever faith or political belief.

### III.

The civilization of the closing years of the nineteenth century, as portrayed by Mr. Bellamy's heroes, is anything but inspiring, and the pity of it is that the gloomy facts and the inevitable and tragic results are so palpably and appallingly true.

The gladness which filled the hearts of Americans in the dawn of the nineteenth century had by its close given place to bitterness of spirit and almost despair on the part of millions of people. The time had been when the United States was in a very real sense a leader of thought among nations. But in those days all were comparatively poor and the only aristocracy was that of heart and brain, or the aristocracy of developed manhood, and the people were then jealous of liberty and justice. Manhood rested on worth. Life had something regal about it, and the glory of the nation was dear to the heart of the people as were honor and faith; for a passion

for freedom, a spirit of humanity, and a deep concern for all her children brought the nation into almost tender relationship with the citizen. Then nature also favored the infant nation. Almost boundless resources were awaiting development, and all had an opportunity to make a livelihood and win the respect and love of others. With time all this changed. Wealth gave ease, and ere long came to command position. Men became money mad. The spirit of greed and avarice fattened in the atmosphere of private capitalism. Invention was made the servant of capital and utilized for the enslavement of man, or at least to render it easy for capital to dictate terms by which the wealth-creators, through incessant toil, might earn a livelihood. The hereditary aristocracy of the Old World had disappeared, but the parvenu aristocracy of wealth in the New World appeared, and soon became greedy, avaricious, reckless of the comfort, the rights, and even the lives of the people. It debauched the press, the pulpit, and the school. It warped public opinion and corrupted legislation. It became a gigantic plutocracy with tentacles stretching around the globe and bloodsucking cups resting on all sources from which men could draw wealth.

Nor must we suppose the oppressors of the masses were peculiar to America. A civilization-wide conflict meets the view, in which it is clear to see that the welfare, comfort, and happiness of the millions are lightly sacrificed, and even health and life are imperilled, in order that the few may enjoy the wealth of the world. But these few could not be called happy, for such is the interdependence of the units in the social organism, such the solidarity of the race, that when the higher law of morals is set at defiance in an attempt to secure one's pleasure at the expense of the rights of others, all the deeper springs of human delight dry up. The pleasures that pall not, but give life its richest fruition, recede as the unworthy seeker approaches them, and what remains gives only pseudo-delight, and ends in satiety, weariness, and ennui even before death takes the barren life from the earth.

The enormous advantages which the few who had acquired large fortunes possessed over the breadwinners by the close of the nineteenth century resulted in relations which



could only be properly described as those of master and slave. In vain did the sleek, well-fed conventional economist declare that wage slavery was not slavery because the "Masters of the Bread" had no power to force the poor to be their slaves, for all thinking men knew, what none knew better than the capitalists, that, with their control of the land, of the mediums of business and trade, and of the means of wealth-creation and wealth-distribution, there was no choice for the millions of their brothers but between starvation and slavery. Hunger and want placed the breadwinners at the mercy of those who held the titles to the sources and means of wealth-creation, without which all must starve. It would be difficult to conceive irony more bitter than that which characterized the servitude of the breadwinners as *voluntary service*. It was true that they could leave their employer and starve, or run the risk of securing a like employment under another master, but the fact remained that a few owned, and, with the power of government, were at all times prepared to preserve their ownership of, the industrial opportunities of the day, which placed the millions of toilers in slavery to the few as surely as if the lash of the slave-driver, instead of deprivation of opportunity to create wealth and pressure of hunger, forced from them their service so long as they were of use to their masters.

It is true that there were some differences between wage slavery and chattel slavery. It is true that the nineteenth-century "Masters of the Bread" did not have to care for their slaves, or have the expense of nursing or keeping them when they were sick or disabled, as did the masters of chattel slaves. The wage slave was left to starve when sickness or misfortune overtook him. Then, again, the moment he became old or unable to do his full quota of work he was cast off to perish miserably or to more miserably eke out a living from the scanty food of his fellow slaves. But it was said that the moral aspect of chattel slavery was incomparably worse in relation to the debauchery of womanhood than wage slavery. The awful revelations disclosed in the "Maiden tribute to the Modern Babylon," and other revelations made during the closing years of the century, should have made

the apologists for wage slavery pass over this frightful phase of both kinds of bondage without apology or defence.

All kinds of slavery are degrading, debauching, and dehumanizing. It is true that, had the millions who created the wealth of the few realized the extent of their slavery and the fact that a darker future inevitably awaited their children under private capitalism, they would have arisen as one man and thrown off the infamous and cruel bondage, so that their children at least might front heaven free men and women, with brain lit up with hope, and heart filled with love and joy. Hence all manner of devices which wealth could employ were ingeniously used to blind the people, to prevent them from thinking independently, and to make them contented with their daily darkening lot. At times the slaves, ground down to starvation point, housed in wretched cabins or huddled in reeking tenements, revolted. They said, We are starving at our work ; we must have a few more pennies or we shall choose to die of quick starvation rather than drag out our miserable existence for a few more months that our masters may be further enriched. The masters, in their lordly palaces, or on their palatial yachts, or travelling in foreign lands, protested that they were not making enough to permit more than starvation wages. Nevertheless they continued to grow richer while the slaves in revolt received small sympathy from the government.

Americans in former days had laughed scornfully at the bayonet-propped monarchies of Europe, saying rightly that a government which needed to be defended by force from its own people was a self-confessed failure. To this pass, however, the industrial system of the United States was fast coming — it was becoming a government by bayonets.

As conditions advanced to their logical climax, and the despotism of a plutocracy rose on the ashes of a free government, not only did the men and women who were strong of limb and able to do much work beg for the privilege to become slaves to the "Masters of the Bread," but men of learning offered to prostitute their splendid gifts for gold. The lawyer and the editor, the priest and the preacher, the executive and legislative officers, and the soldier became servants of the Lords of Land, the Lords of Money, and the Lords of the Mart. Then was beheld that startling picture

which Victor Hugo portrayed as representing the state of a society in which the ideal was eclipsed: "The venal judge, the simoniacal priest, the hireling soldier, turpitude at the summit of all professions, and the sinking of man to the level of the human beast."

If the outlook was gloomy from the standpoint of the breadwinner, it was scarcely less inspiring from the vantage-ground of the moralist. The nineteenth century witnessed the greatest inventions in labor-saving machines the world had ever seen. By their means the work of fifteen or twenty persons was frequently performed by a single individual, while other inventions distributed the wealth productions everywhere at comparatively small expense. These inventions, under a rule of human brotherhood such as Jesus demanded of all who would be His disciples, would have transformed the face of the civilized world, given leisure for the growth and development of brain, time for enjoyment of life to man, woman, and child; but under the essentially barbarous conditions of the competitive system and the rule of self these potential blessings served to greatly increase the sufferings of the millions by glutting the wage market and cheapening labor and life.

Again, the waste of human life due to this system formed the most tragic page of history. Neither the wars between nations nor the pestilences which at intervals swept over them were nearly so destructive to life as the ceaseless economic warfare of the competitive system. It became quite popular in the closing years of the nineteenth century to demand that there should be no more war between nations. The holders of stocks, bonds, and vested interests, which war would imperil, suddenly appeared to become marvelously humane, and waxed eloquent in depicting the horrors of war between nations, the carnage of the battlefield, and the sacrifice of life. This extreme solicitude for peace in the interests of their wealth was so pronounced that great peoples like the Armenian Christians were slaughtered in the most horrible manner by the Turks, and Greece was crushed by the Ottoman amid frightful slaughter while all Europe looked complacently on at the carnage. The fair island of

Cuba was swept by fire and sword, men perished, maidens were ravished, and American citizens were insulted, imprisoned, and slain while the Republic of the United States supinely witnessed the heroic battle for freedom and the insult to the stars and stripes with barely a weak protest, for the lords of Wall Street so willed it. Though a healthy peace sentiment was greatly to be encouraged, and peace with honor and the vindication of justice and humanity's rights was always to be worked for, yet how pitifully insignificant in nature and extent was the waste of life and limb or the cost of happiness involved in the war between nations compared with the frightful war that was ceaselessly going on throughout the civilized world, and which was known as the "economic struggle." "More lives were sacrificed in this great battle in one month than in all the international wars in a generation."

by whom?

The horrors of the perpetual economic war beggar description. There were no braying of trumpets, no banners floating, no glorious cause to stimulate the combatants. Nor was the struggle confined to the strong men. The women, the aged, the maidens, the little children, the sick, and the crippled battled, suffered, and were not infrequently slain in the conflict, which ceased not either day or night. In every city, in the towns, and in the country the cries of the victims and the curses of the dying were heard. They fell under the wheel on every hand, and their places were quickly filled by other gaunt figures who entered the gap and faced the same fate for a little food to silence nature's cravings, and some rags to clothe the nakedness of the body. Their lightest moments were canopied with fear of hunger, eviction, sickness, and the potter's field. The recklessness in the sacrifice of human life, when that life belonged to a wage slave, was seen by the records, which showed that at least two hundred thousand men, women, and children were every year maimed or killed "in performance of their industrial duties." The victims of the railroad system of the United States under private capital reached almost forty thousand maimed or killed a year. So careless was capital of the lives of the wage slaves and so pitifully were they

often remunerated that a saying was current that nothing was so cheap as human life.

Upon woman the pressure was very terrible. It had often been urged that there was nothing about chattel slavery more revolting than the subjugation of woman to the lust of the masters. But under the rule of the "Masters of the Bread" and the pressure of want armies of women in all great cities were compelled by poverty to make a business of submitting their bodies to those who were able to furnish them means to buy bread. Nor did the wrong stop here. One of the most tragic pages of the closing years of the nineteenth century was the story of child slavery. In attic, in cellar, in factories, pale, gaunt, and pinched little children toiled early and late, knowing little of schooling, less of the beauties of earth, and practically nothing of the comforts of home.

Looked at from whatever point of view, the moral aspect of social life in the closing years of the nineteenth century was notable chiefly for its conspicuous lack of sound or far-reaching morality. The work done in the name of charity was a pitiful palliative, false in character, as it carefully avoided striking at the root of the evil and securing justice for all, but rather sought to perpetuate the system which was eclipsing war and pestilence in the number of its victims; a system which denied the earth to God's children and held the means of livelihood from men unless they accepted what was practically slavery; a system which looked complacently on the spectacle of millions of men asking for work and receiving none, while a few hundred millionaires and multi-millionaires chained up resources which would have afforded productive labor for all, and while the government refused to take control of public utilities in the name of humanity as well as economy.

This brings us to the notice of the economic side of the question. Through the profit system there arose a gap between the producer and consumer which operated according to law in such a manner as to make production greater than consumption, while the consumption was far less than the requirements of the people called for. But the people, having to pay much more for what they consumed than they received

for what they made or produced, were unable to secure what they needed. The difference between the price and the cost was the amount which the capitalist charged for profit. This profit, which frequently made men very rich, was levied on the producer and consumer by a non-wealth-producing class. Thus, take for example a pair of shoes, which we will say cost the capitalist for making and labor before they were completed forty cents; he sold them to the middleman for seventy-five cents, the middleman sold them to the retailer for a dollar, and the retailer sold them to the consumer for a dollar and a half. The shoes originally cost forty cents, but before the consumer got them he paid a dollar and ten cents above the first cost for the support of men who, in the absence of proper methods for distribution, were enabled to levy almost three times the original cost of the article from the consumer. *These were not wealth-creators.* The effect of this was to create a deadly gap between the producing and consuming power of those engaged in producing the things on which profits were charged.

The ability to purchase necessities on the part of the wealth-producers was limited by the comparatively small price they received for what they created and the enormous relative price they had to pay owing to the tariff levied by the profit-takers. Producers, or wage-earners, constituted at least nine-tenths of the entire population. The profit-takers were insignificant in number, but their rule was, Tax the tariff all it will bear. Its rule was, Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest.

Hence the time came all too soon when the profit-takers found the markets glutted with goods for which there was little demand, because the producers received so little for their productions that they could not buy what they needed, while the small body of profit-takers were able to consume comparatively little. *The result was the astonishing spectacle of a glut in the markets, with the wealth-creators suffering for the very things with which the market was overstocked.* The conventional economists called this *overproduction*. With this so-called overproduction came a check on manufacture, or production. Thousands of men were thrown out of employment, and other thousands made so little that they were compelled to borrow money or live on starvation rations. A glut of men followed the glut of the markets, and these



men, with starvation staring them in the face, began competing for an opportunity to produce by offering to undersell each other if thereby they might be saved from starvation.

Through interest, rents, and profits, as well as special privileges of various kinds, an insignificant body of men grew immensely rich, while the millions eagerly sought work to save them from dire want. These very rich soon controlled the means of support of life and by their positions were able to grow richer, while the misery of the multitude grew apace. The rich indulged in all kinds of luxuries, while the poor starved. But because they required the services of the poor to minister to their wanton luxury, their apologists pointed to them as philanthropists giving food to the starving. A two-hundred-and-fifty-thousand-dollar ball was heralded over the land as an act of humanity because it afforded a little work for a few of the nation's starving millions. That men and women were so eager to seize on any work that might give them a few pence illustrates the actual working of the profit system in the closing years of its long and wicked debauch. Even the conventional economists of that time admitted the hopelessness of the outlook under the profit system, while refusing to recognize the practicability of any other system. They frankly admitted that the profit system must inevitably result at an early date in an arrest of industrial progress and a stationary condition of production. They could not fail to see, what all thoughtful men who thought on the subject knew, that rents, interest, and profits continued to accumulate wealth in the hands of the capitalistic class, "while the consuming power of the masses did not increase," but either decreased or remained practically stationary. "This stationary condition was setting in in the last years of the nineteenth century," but the needs of the wealth-creators were not met. Here was an economic system whose apostles confessed that it was at the end of its resources "in the midst of a naked and starving race." From an economic point of view the profit system could only be fairly described as suicidal. From the standpoints of manhood, of morality, and of economics the competitive system stands convicted of inhumanity, immorality, and imbecility.

I have merely touched upon three of the cardinal points in the terrible indictment made in this volume against a system which is also arraigned for its offences against liberty of thought and expression, against the health of the body and the growth of the soul, against art and progress, against Christianity — being not merely un-Christian but anti-Christian, antagonizing and setting at naught as it did the Golden Rule, the ethics, and the very life of the Founder of Christianity — against liberty, justice, and the larger life for woman to which she was entitled, and last but not least its offence against childhood. For millions of little ones this system meant something worse than death, making them old almost before they had bidden farewell to infancy, and rendering them sodden and brutal before the dew of youth was off their brow. The civilization of the last decade of the nineteenth century had been vividly described in prophetic lines by Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, in his description of the vision given by the genius to King Arthur, picturing the age known as “the Elysium of the Mart:”

Slow fades the pageant, and the phantom stage  
 As slowly filled with squalid, ghastly forms;  
 Here, over fireless hearths, cowered shivering Age  
 And blew with feeble breath dead embers; storms  
 Hung in the icy welkin, and the bare  
 Earth lay forlorn in Winter's charnel air.

No careless childhood laughed disportingly,  
 But dwarfed, pale mandrakes, with a century's gloom  
 On infant brows, beneath a poison tree,  
 With skeleton fingers plied a ghastly loom;  
 Mocking in cynic jests life's gravest things,  
 They wove gay king-robcs, muttering, “What are kings?”

And thro' that dreary Hades to and fro,  
 Stalked, all unheeded, the Tartarean guests:  
 Grim Discontent, that loathes the Gods, and Woe,  
 Claspings dead infants to her milkless breasts;  
 And maddening Hate, and Force, with iron heel,  
 And voiceless Vengeance, sharpening secret steel.

“Can such things be below and God above?”

Faltercd the king. Replied the genius, “Nay,  
 This is the state that sages most approve;

This is man civilized, the perfect sway  
 Of merchant kings, the ripeness of the art  
 Which cheapens men — the Elysium of the Mart.”

## IV.

Out of the dark background of nineteenth-century social and economic chaos rose the splendid vision of a free people, a true democracy, a sane government. The dynasty of wealth, which subverted the republic and destroyed democratic government, gave way before the onward sweep of an aroused and outraged intelligence. From the wreck of the old rose the first truly free government, based on justice, and carrying with it love and the spirit of fraternity. So artificial had society grown prior to this great revolution that, like the old civilization of Greece and Rome, it had almost lost the power to recognize its own artificiality. So completely was the public mind debauched that men posing as statesmen and economists argued that the Golden Rule could never be carried out in government or in business, and that Jesus was an impractical dreamer. But while they so spoke and taught, millions of men were groping toward the light. Palliative remedies had been brought forward, favorite prescriptions had been urged, but as the oppression continued and the slavery became more and more terrible, extending to thought and expression as well as to bodily service, a great light dawned on men. They saw that in coöperation and the spirit of fraternity lay the hope of the ages. They knew that they were creating wealth enough to secure in comfort and happiness every man, woman, and child in the nation, even though the able-bodied toiled only half a day. A duty so solemn, so tremendous in its import, and so glorious in its promise confronted men that it made life august and death for the cause sublime. Not alone for their own happiness and that of the loved ones in their homes did justice, liberty, and manhood urge men to action, but for the millions upon millions who were battling with despair in country and city. Not simply for the millions of their day, but for generations yet unborn, were the oppressed led to assert their manhood and make a second and greater Declaration of Independence. The clock of the ages had sounded another advance for the race. The glory that had long lighted the brow of the prophet lit up the faces of the people. With a passion for freedom, for a larger life, for a fraternal government, a

coöperative commonwealth, men rent the chains of the despotism of wealth and established the new order.

They had learned much during their bondage in Egypt. Not the least was the importance of guarding the freedom of each in order to secure the liberty of all. They had also learned that democracy could only be preserved upon the earth by the people making the laws. Without provisions such as the Initiative, the Referendum, and the Imperial Mandate the perpetuity of any really popular government would be in jeopardy. Hence these were at once guaranteed to the nation forever. Freedom, fraternity, equality, and justice were made the corner-stone of the new social structure.

So splendid were the results which flowed from the reign of the brain illuminated by altruism that all former upward steps paled before the newborn civilization. With the coöperative commonwealth life took on new meaning. That vicious partial paternalism which had so long cursed the thousands while it permitted the tens to grow so rich as to enslave their fellow men, and which ultimately destroyed all vestige of free government save its name, its shell, and its dishonored flag, disappeared before a fraternalism which embraced all the citizens of the republic as children of one father, the interest of one being the concern of all. No longer were the majority of people compelled to work eight, ten, twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hours in twenty-four. No one was required to labor more than half a day, and all had long vacations at stated intervals. Thus everyone had ample opportunity to enjoy the pure delights of life to the uttermost and to increase his store of knowledge; or, in the quaint phrase of Colet, each one was enabled to "proceed to grow," an opportunity which the vast majority had never before enjoyed. No longer did fear of want canopy life, or dread of a penniless age make life a perpetual nightmare, for all men, women, and children had ample for a life of comfort guaranteed, and when any reached the age of forty-five they were exempt from compulsory labor. All those things which most fostered the tiger, the hyena, the serpent, and the wolf in man were done away with, while the divine in every soul was stimulated by all life's environments no less than the larger

and nobler inheritance vouchsafed to all. No longer did civilization present the startling and deeply tragic spectacle which was everywhere present in the closing years of the old republic, — the compulsory idleness of man, the enforced prostitution of woman, and the inevitable slavery of the child.

Let us take a closer inspection of this new coöperative commonwealth, beginning with the young. Each child, as well as every man and woman, received a credit card each year. Hence the little one was in no sense a financial burden to the father and mother. It had until the age of twenty-one, whether boy or girl, to complete its education, after which a probationary term enabled each person to try different kinds of occupation pleasing to the taste and inclination in order that he might select work to which he was adapted and which was most to his taste. Short school hours and ample vacations did not prevent the child from receiving an all-round education entirely unlike the narrow intellectual training and system of mental cramming which characterizes our faulty educational methods. As the five fingers of the hand can be opened with greater ease than one finger, so the full educational course which developed body, brain, and soul gave to schooling a charm never known before, and prevented mental exhaustion. A broad hygienic education was a part of each child's schooling. The physiological and hygienic education included thorough gymnastic drill and sports which were not brutal or too boisterous, but which called into healthful exercise the various parts of the body. A broad, comprehensive, and practical intellectual education taught every child to appreciate the beauties of nature and art.

The soul life was also developed. With ethics as a basis of life, with a deep concern for the good of all, and the cultivation of unselfishness instead of a studied disregard for the happiness of the world, came a new view of life. Indeed, never before had the soul of man been permitted to expand and blossom. In freedom and all absence from carking care and a haunting fear in regard to the comforts of existence now or in the days to come, man found that the generous impulses and bright ideals of childhood received no check, but were developed as life progressed. The old phrases

which signified the deadening of true soul life, such as "learning to take the world as it is," "being practical," and "getting over romantic notions," were no longer current. Life grew at once ideal and practical. Freedom and love were blossoming on the brow of civilization, and, indeed, education for most people only commenced at twenty-one, when the young left school for the leisure of at least one-half of each day and of the long months of vacation each year, giving ample opportunity for any person to perfect himself in any study or to broaden his store of learning in various directions, as the opportunities for obtaining knowledge were free to all, and every person was encouraged to further develop the body, brain, and soul. Childhood took on a happiness never known before even by the richest and most favored children. The young no longer looked forward to leaving school with the dread of an uncertain life of terrible drudgery before them.

The great change or revolution which thus transformed childhood brought woman into a new world, a world of freedom and growth. Through this great revolution woman was delivered from a bondage that was "incomparably more complete and abject than any to which man was subjected."

It was forced not by a single, but by a triple yoke. The first was the subjugation to the personal and class rule of the rich, which the mass of women bore in common with the mass of men. The other two yokes were peculiar to her. One of them was her personal subjection, not only in the sexual relation, but in all her behavior, to the particular man on whom she depended for subsistence. The third yoke was an intellectual and moral one, and consisted in the slavish conformity exacted of her in all her thinking, speaking, and acting to a set of traditions and conventional standards calculated to repress all that was individual and spontaneous, and impose an artificial uniformity upon both the inner and outer life.

Woman was also the slave of fashion, which was injurious to health, destructive to comfort, and grotesque in the extreme. The economic freedom of woman, coming as it did on a wave of moral enthusiasm, served as "a mighty upthrust to a plane of moral dignity and material welfare." The revolution was the voice of God calling her to a new creation.

Nor were freedom, growth, and happiness confined to children and women. The great majority of men knew for the



first time freedom from fear of want, from dread of the morrow or uneasiness about the future of their loved ones. For the first time man had learned to enjoy life and the surroundings which drew out the best in him and yielded the deepest pleasure. With music, theatres, and lectures free, and public utilities at the command of all, he was able to have, to see, and to hear the best the world afforded, while the labor the state required of each adult reached a maximum limit in five hours a day, during the days when the individual was expected to work; and after the age of forty-five all were exempt from compulsory employment. Persons had a choice of work, which was so arranged as to be equalized, and it was compulsory on the part of the state to supply all persons with employment within easy reach of their homes, provided the individual desired it. Should the special field he wished to enter be filled, he could choose another employment, unless he preferred to work elsewhere. Inventions had progressed marvellously under the new *régime*, as inventors were given every advantage and opportunity to work out their inventions, and every labor-saving machine or beneficent invention proved a blessing to all, either lessening the hours of work, increasing the wealth productions of the people, or adding to their common pleasure or comfort.

These are, however, only hints of the changed state under the first true democracy, whose motto was Freedom, Fraternity, and Equality. And perhaps nowhere did the change bring about such splendid results as those witnessed in the religious life of man. The old saying of Jesus was at last appreciated: "Neither in this mountain nor at Jerusalem." The religious life grew broad. The form, rite, and dogma had less and less spell over man as the spirit of love rose. The life rather than the belief, love for all or the recognition of human brotherhood opened the door to a perfect realization of the great common Father, whose name is Love, and who dwells in Light. With growth in spirituality man drew nearer the Infinite Father and the glorious beyond which awaits the soul. Light dawned on the conscience of man sufficiently to "turn the shadow of death into a bow of promise, and distilled the saltiness out of human tears."

This vision in its completeness and its reasonableness is one of the noblest pictures of what the world may become, nay, what it shall become before man knows true happiness. For until the Golden Rule becomes the rule of life humanity will grovel in the cellars of being. Mr. Bellamy has given no false note. All his thoughts and ideas are in alignment with justice, progress, freedom, and human elevation. His voice is that of the true prophet. His work will create a profound impression upon minds capable of independent thinking and not blinded by egoism.

The horizon of man is broadening. The religion of the Sermon on the Mount is at length taking root in the hearts of men, and I believe the day of justice, brotherhood, and love will come ere long, when these lines of William Morris will be realized in the future of a truer and saner civilization than earth has yet known :

Come hither, lads, and hearken,  
For a tale there is to tell  
Of the wonderful days a-coming, when all  
Shall be better than well.

Then a man shall work and bethink him,  
And rejoice in the deeds of his hand,  
Nor yet come home in the even  
Too faint and weary to stand.  
Men in that time a-coming  
Shall work and have no fear  
For to-morrow's lack of earning  
And the hunger-wolf anear.

I tell you this for a wonder,  
That no man then shall be glad  
Of his fellow's fall and mishap  
To snatch at the work he had.  
For that which the worker winneth  
Shall then be his indeed,  
Nor shall half be reaped for nothing  
By him that sowed no seed.

O strange, new, wonderful justice!  
But for whom shall we gather the gain?  
For ourselves and each of our fellows,  
And no hand shall labor in vain.  
Then all Mine and all Thine shall be Ours,  
And no more shall any man crave  
For riches that serve for nothing  
But to fetter a friend for a slave.

## THE DEAD HAND IN THE CHURCH.

BY REV. CLARENCE LATHBURY.

CENTURIES ago our English ancestors awakened to the startling fact that a vast portion of the national territory had fallen into dead hands and was administered according to statutes framed by dead brains. In short, the inhabitants of the unseen universe were slowly but surely getting their grip on the kingdom, and it was only a matter of time when the living would be ruled by the dead. The silent and inexorable company of the disembodied, to whom no protest might be made, whom no pity could move, were getting the reins of government. To avert the approaching calamity its extension was prohibited by the statute of mortmain.

In the State of New York a backward step has been taken. Protestant institutions were free to follow the predilections of their own consciences, instead of the consciences of their great-great-grandfathers. But in 1875 a law was enacted permitting a church or educational institution to be incorporated and set going for all time under the guarantee of the state that so long as a half-dozen persons desired — though a thousand others dissented — the property might be held to the original purpose.

This is worse than Romanism. The Roman Church is subject to a living pope influenced by the sentiment of his era, but the Protestant bodies are ruled by a set of dead popes whose voices and decrees are heard only in their writings. Having passed on to clearer vision, and supposedly outgrown their crude views and judgments, they are doomed to control posterity and tie it to a desiccated past. Presumably moving along lines of spiritual evolution they would be horrified at their oppression, crystallized and perpetuated, lying like an incubus on willing vassals. There is the possibility of establishing institutions in this "land of the free and home of the brave" and imposing upon them popes

and autocrats worse than Leo XIII or Abdul Hamid. The hand still and cold is stretched forth from the grave, and is mightier than a thousand hands of the living. It is obstructing the path of human development. The disintegrated brains of Augustine and the early Fathers, of Luther, of Calvin, of Wesley, of Channing, of Ballou, the makers of artificial and inane creeds who flourished in the Dark Ages of the planet, hold posterity back from the shining gates of present revelation, and their skeleton fingers fasten it to the decrepit body of a dying creed.

This is especially evident in the field of theology. Our denominational seminaries lie helplessly under the benumbing influence of the dead hand, automatically chanting the litanies and rehearsing the creeds of ancient times. They are moored in the quiet inlets of the stream of thought flowing to the infinite sea. Physical science keeps pace with the spheres, but theology gropes in charnel houses and, like the antiquarian, busies itself with the *débris* of structures that have served their generation. Science stands erect with clear eye and open face, but the dead finger of a dead past is pointed at theology, and theology slinks away tremblingly, not daring to meet the ghost and bid it down.

Why should this generation become the puppet of any that has preceded it? It was not for the Fathers to bind the future to ordinances that would be inevitably outgrown. The man of the stagecoach times cannot plan for the swiftly coming epoch of steam and electricity. The most altruistic and prophetic of the Fathers could not have outlined the beatific disclosures of these remarkable days. They have sought to perpetuate theories that are now as extinct as the dodo. The authors of them would be as amused at them as we are. The legislation of the dead hand is inflicting absurdities on the venerable present. Free thought and untrammelled research are forbidden because they endanger such legislation. The planet should be governed by living hands and intellects, by men and women with eyes and ears wide open to the messages of this decade. The old theologies are as foreign to us as are the old astronomies or physiologies. Truth must be interpreted by each generation and adapted to its

requirements. The manna must be gathered fresh every morning; it will not keep overnight. New sunlight, direct from the sky, is needed for the new day. Hoarded water becomes stagnant and deadly; it must continually fall from the clouds and filter through the hills, replenishing our springs. The atmosphere of the Middle Ages—the air that Calvin, or Luther, or Elizabeth breathed—will not do for us. We must live in the present if we are to live at all.

The bathos of the dead hand in science, sociology, and industrial progress is more pronounced because less customary. What a theme for the cartoonist! The professor of physical geography representing the earth to be flat because the Fathers so represented it! The astronomer teaching that the stars circle about the earth because the old astronomers did so! The physiologist denying the modern theory of the circulation of the blood because it is not found in traditional physiology! The chemist searching for the elixir of life, the traveller for the fountain of youth, the mariner for the fabled Atlantis or Sea of Darkness, because the Fathers thus groped in the gloom of an ignorance harmonious with those young days of discovery! The anthropologist endeavoring to set civilization to the pure and simple era of the childhood of the race! The theologian urging us back to the apostolic crudities! "Let us turn back the pages of nineteen centuries, become babes again—and rest in the blessed state of callow innocence." It is the old cry that would undo the struggles, and tears, and attainments since creation. It is the song of the sluggard, the liturgy of the church of the heavenly rest.

This enthroning the Fathers and handing them the sceptre of the present is simply puerile. We are the ancients. The world was never so old and wise as now. The modern man gathers up the erudition and experiences of all cycles of history, and supplements them with those of the present. He is therefore the conclusion and embodiment of all discovery and wisdom since the dawn of time. Why then should he go to the Fathers? It is more fitting that they should come to him. Science takes this only reasonable position. The

university that should attempt to reiterate the past would die out and become an amusing memory.

The dead hand in theology is even more ridiculous, for it enters a domain higher and grander. If it is intolerable in the science of the rocks, the stars, and the verdure, how is it in theology — the science of God? It is worse, for it throttles the moral life, arresting moral growth. It stupefies the God-given intellect and turns it into a thinking machine manipulated by persons who have lain in their graves, it may be, for millenniums. It is a kind of animated Ouija or Planchette moved by spirits of long ago who are forbidden to return with intuitions gained since the terrestrial record closed. Why not restate theology in modern terminology, as well as biology, zoölogy, philology, psychology, or any of the other ologies? Why take a photograph of an ancient portrait that could never have been exact, when the living truth may be thrown up by a modern camera? Why ask what ancient theology said that the Bible said that Christ or Moses said that God said, when God is here in greater power and clearer vision than ever before? Why procure our sunlight by the roundabout process of the moon reflected from a mirror, when the dear old orb is shining in the heaven of to-day? Why take a report of a report of a report, when we may listen to God for ourselves?

Note the blessed freedom vouchsafed by one of our theological seminaries (Lane Seminary at Cincinnati) to her students. The Presbytery of Cincinnati utters itself thus nobly:

We advocate a full and free critical study of the scriptures for the purpose of vindicating the true nature of the scriptures as held by our church.

This is Romanism simple and pure, with a dead pope in the pontifical chair. It places the Bible back where it was when it lay in the hands of the priests or was chained to the pillars of English cathedrals. The Bible may be studied fully and generously — provided an agreement shall be made that such study shall lead to conclusions *arrived at by the Fathers of the church*. Fancy Harvard Medical School saying to its students: "Take your microscope and search freely, provided you will agree to contradict Pasteur's theory



of microbes!" or the Massachusetts Institute of Technology delivering itself in this wise: "Study electricity frankly and exhaustively, but be sure to reject any revelations that might substantiate the modern delusion of the X-rays, or the heretical claims of Edison in relation to the phonograph!" or our liberal universities saying to those who come to study: "Be thorough and broad in your pursuit of social science, provided you resolutely hold to the traditional theories of the origin of man, and sustain the old and blessed doctrine of indiscriminate philanthropy!" "Study astronomy in all freedom, but avoid Copernicus's impossible conclusions as to the structure of the solar system!"

Injunctions such as these practically say: "You may not study at all." To study in order to reach a conclusion already reached, under instructions to ignore any new light that might affect those conclusions adversely, is not to study genuinely. It is to close out liberty and light, and to end where we began. It is an absurd waste of time. It is to be forever turning about in an ecclesiastical half-bushel. No wonder there is so much talk about the decadence of the pulpit. How could it be otherwise when the novice is thus handicapped and drugged? No man of independence and force will submit to any such thing, and the church thus bars out that which would give her life and length of years. Let us note a few things the dead hand is doing for the church.

It forbids the frank study of the scriptures. In the days of Christ the Bible was in the hands of the scribes; in Luther's time the priests held the keys of interpretation; to-day the individual sects maintain traditional teachings which the adherent is given to understand he must find in the Bible. Untrammelled liberty of investigation is denied. The clergyman or theological student must be a sacred phonograph through whom the church utters itself. Like the Chinese, he bows at the shrines of his ancestors, reiterates their sentiments, and the dead hand becomes a shaping influence, the ruin of living ideals, the suppression of the hopes of the future.

It induces hypocrisy. A creed as ambiguous and double-faced as a political platform is represented as written by the

finger of Deity, to which the catechumen is asked to append his signature of assent. If his mental endowments are too meagre to compass it, he is urged to bring to bear upon it the transmogrifying powers of faith; which is but another way of asking him to "make believe he believes." He cannot believe what he does not comprehend. He can only believe what is intelligible. But he is told that it is his duty to believe what the very constitution of his mind precludes. He cannot believe that Mr. Rockefeller is president of the Standard Oil Company unless the name Rockefeller calls up a definite personality, and the term presidency a definite office. He cannot believe that the lion is a carnivorous beast unless he knows enough Latin to comprehend that carnivorous means flesh-eating. He cannot believe that nitrous oxide is a gas unless he knows the essential properties of nitrous oxide. If he does not know what nitrous oxide is, the sentence resolves itself into this: "—— is a gas." And this is a sentence in which there is nothing to believe or disbelieve. He cannot believe that the Holy Spirit is "of the Father and the Son, neither made, nor begotten, but proceeding," unless he understands the meaning of these terms.

Language which he does not comprehend is to him as an unknown tongue. It is a mere sound, and he can no more believe in the sound of a sentence than in the sound of a gale of wind. A meaningless statement cannot be believed, for the simple reason that there is nothing in it to be believed or disbelieved. To say that God is a person, and that there are three persons who are God, is to say that three persons are one, and one person is three. If he can believe one to be three, he can believe it to be thirty, or three hundred, or three thousand.

Yet the traditionalists require belief in the meaningless. If the too honest mind dissents, the priests who hold the keys of heaven lock him out.

For ages the clergy have lamented the lack of faith, when all the time the curse of humanity has been the lack of doubt. It would be hard enough in any case to get men to think for themselves, yet the unpardonable sin has been to refuse to "make believe believe." Until the close of the seventeenth century independent thought was branded as heresy. The most deadly intellectual vices were inculcated.

It was a sin to doubt the opinions in which one had been brought up. It was a virtue to rehearse them with unquestioning fidelity.

"Oh, sirs," said Mr. Spurgeon, "could ye roll all sins into one, could ye take murder and blasphemy and adultery and everything that is vile, and unite them into one vast globe of black corruption, they would not equal the sin of unbelief."

"Avoid inquiry," said Cardinal Newman, "for it will lead you where there is no light, no peace, no hope; it will lead you into the deep pit where the sun and moon and stars and beauteous heavens are not, but chilliness and barrenness and perpetual desolation."

The dead hand also drains the church of her rich lifeblood. Her virile and independent thinkers are either barred out or cast out. Sciences and philosophies offer a free field of research; the church offers subjection, thralldom, crucifixion. The hero of truth, looking to the ministry as a field of service, sees himself fettered and tied to the past. Few have the resolution to be willing to fight for freedom with one hand and for truth with the other. The pulpit should be the broadest platform on earth; the traditionalists have turned it into a dungeon. The minister should be the freest of men; the traditionalists load him with chains. Imperial scholars and righteous gentlemen, like Professors Briggs and Smith, are branded and slandered. The independent thinker who ventures to speak out is pilloried before the world. The identical spirit that stoned the prophets, murdered Jesus, burned Huss, persecuted Luther, and malignantly pursued Wesley, Channing, and Phillips Brooks is yet abroad. The traditionalists have from the first been the inveterate foes of progress. Traditionalism arrests growth. It denies that growth is possible. Men must tread forever the worn paths of their ancestors. They must become the satellites of churchmen who are in their tombs. In science it would leave us amid the crude environment of the dawn of history. It would keep the race forever in swaddling-clothes. In theology we should still be teaching infant damnation and an undivine partiality that deliberately creates the masses of humankind for eternal anguish.

The dead hand also fosters a doctrine of sectarian infallibility that prohibits progress. Each denomination has its individual pope to whom all disagreements are referred. The shades of Wesley or Calvin or Luther or Ballou or Channing are called up as arbiters. There is an irrefutable standard

about which the constellated bodies of Christendom gather. With one it is baptism, another lineal apostolic descent, another the trinity, another salvation by faith; with others it is sanctification, feet-washing, faith-healing, or some other of a thousand shibboleths too distracting to record. With the Hebrew Church it was the infallible Mishna; with the Roman Church it is the infallible Pope; with the Protestants, infallible doctrine, drawn from an infallible Word, by infallible interpreters.

Infallibility forbids original research. Things are as crystallized and unshakable as the hills. Infallibility works well in the lower realm of figures, but it is fatal to revelation. There is an axiomatic rule for adding two and two; they have always made four, and always will; and there is no possibility of a difference in opinion. Every man on the face of the earth must order his faith and practice by this undeviating ordinance. There is an unerring rule for placing a brace, or constructing an arch. But the instant we enter the higher domain of morals infallibility ceases. There is no infallible rule for composing a Handel's "Messiah," for painting a sunset or an "Angelus," for carving a statue, or for enjoying a landscape. There is no infallible rule for loving truth, beauty, purity, or goodness. There is no infallible rule for holy patriotism, sacred heroism, eternal hope. It would be absurd to ask Congress to enact a statute by which every citizen of the Republic might become loyal and brave.

Nor can any number of ecclesiastical councils create a formula by which men may become godlike. Law is fulfilled by love and grace. The entire Bible is condensed by Jesus into a single sentence — love to God and man. "This is the whole law and the prophets." Infallibility would be a curse to men if it were vouchsafed. He cannot be free, virile, courageous, self-reliant, strong, when confined to a treadmill existence. It is for brutes to follow infallible instincts, but man is an independent force in the universe. The planet must drop forever along the line of its orbit, but man may take an eccentric course. Infallibility has ever attracted the sluggish intellect. There are temperaments too inane to think or act for themselves; like children who have never

learned to go alone, they have no desire to walk so long as they may be carried by others. The fatal weakness of the masses in the church is a willingness to be yoked to the ecclesiastical machine. Millions of minds repose in the stagnant peace of an inflexible dogma. There is a general longing for a faith cut, dried, and irrefutable, a theology from which there is no appeal; and the clergy are most of them willing to furnish it. They itch for a horde of mental vassals to adore and enthrone them as absolute monarchs of their thoughts. The hunger for an infallible church, doctrine, priest, Bible, or friend is great, and the secret of it is discovered in intellectual indolence. Men who will work tremendously will not take the trouble to think religiously. But the good God denies infallibility, and forever and forever He will deny it. He has created man to a high destiny, and will not extinguish that which constitutes his humanity — independence of thought and action.

Orthodoxy is no longer descriptive of true theology. It simply means slavish adherence to that which has been. It is becoming a term of reproach. It must now be defined as that which is old, regular, dull, unprogressive. Heresy has taken on illuminated characters and stands for that which is optimistic and up to date. The prophet is a heretic — and always has been. The clear voices of Hebrew history were hushed in the silence of dungeons and sepulchres. In the sense of eccentricity from lines of truth it is the traditionalist who is the heretic. He who bends backward is as much out of line as he who leans forward. But forward is the movement of the ages; evolution is the watchword of the times. Not only the planets are moving, but the very suns and constellations are making to some distant goal.

This is the normal attitude; quiescence is abnormal. Every atom, down to the central fires of the planet, is in motion. The heretic searches the sky for promised lands; his face is to the east, and the light of morning transfigures it. The traditionalist dwells amid the detritus of a crumbled past. He is not constructive, expectant, hopeful. He is a sombre figure on whose face lie unutterable shadows.

## HYPNOTISM IN ITS SCIENTIFIC AND FORENSIC ASPECTS.

BY MARION L. DAWSON, B. L.

THE mind was given man to reason with, to investigate, to find out the undiscovered, to analyze and separate the true from the false. Thus the bold and independent thinker carries forward the torch of knowledge, enlightens the dark places, and chases from the path of science the lurking shadows of ignorance and superstition.

He, however, who seeks to examine conflicting views regarding disputed scientific theories for the purpose of discovering the correct theory, or the true basic law upon which a particular science rests, should be careful, in pursuing his investigations, not to be enticed away from the truth by some plausible but erroneous theory. All thoughtful persons will agree that no arguments are worthy of serious consideration unless they are founded upon demonstrable facts.

Conceding the soundness of this general proposition, the modest effort will be made to explain the possible cause of the acrimonious differences of opinion held by the various schools of hypnotism concerning the proper method of inducing hypnosis, and how these differences may be reconciled. Also to inquire whether the so-called unscrupulous "hypnotizer" or "magnetizer" is, as the public have been taught to believe, a dangerous member of society, and whether legislative action, for the purpose of restraining the use of hypnotic suggestion to any class or profession, is necessary or advisable.

From the earliest times the psychical condition now commonly known as hypnotism has been recognized by mankind. Interest in the mysterious, particularly that phase of it which pertains to the functions of the brain, is one of the strongest of human characteristics, and the ability which some especially gifted individuals were supposed, until recent years, to possess, to control the actions, silence the conscience, and



dominate the will of others by the exercise of mysterious and occult powers, naturally afforded a subject for fascinating study. For many years, however, the progress of this science was retarded. It had to struggle slowly over many difficulties. Ignorance and superstition hopelessly enveloped it in a cloud of supernatural mysticism. No reference had been made to it in scientific text-books; therefore it was ignored and condemned by scientists. It came to the Western world as a new psychical truth, which threatened to revolutionize scientific theories, and these learned men of the West were not prepared to confess or believe that any scientific fact could exist which was not consistent with their own theories. Not understanding hypnotism, they boldly denied its existence, and opposed its advance as they have so often resisted the acceptation and promulgation of scientific truths. It is a sad fact that some of the greatest and most useful scientific discoveries have been given to the world not by the aid of scientists as a class, but rather in spite of their determined and concentrated opposition.

As science drew back, charlatans and knaves advanced, and, with a few notable exceptions, this science flourished only in the hands of the latter. The "conjurer," the "fakir," and the "sorcerer" found in it a valuable aid to the mystifying frauds which they perpetrated on a credulous public.

While it is not advisable in an article of this sort to inquire into the history of "hypnotism," it is necessary to examine the methods which are taught in the various schools of the science for inducing hypnosis, and the theories which they hold regarding the phenomena of the hypnotic state.

Every writer of note whose works I have examined has advocated a method of his own for inducing hypnotic sleep, and each gives a plausible reason why his is the only proper one. They are all, however, modifications of the teachings of two great schools. One the Salpêtrière, which was founded at Paris by Charcot in 1878; it teaches the Braidian method and defends his theories, holds that hypnosis is a physiological rather than a psychical state, and that those of diseased nervous systems make the best subjects. The other is the "Nancy School," which was established about 1884,

and which owes its existence to Liébault, who is, with the possible exception of Prof. Bernheim, the greatest living student of this branch of psychology. The theory held by it is that hypnosis is purely psychical in its nature, and that it is induced by suggestion alone; that all of its phenomena are controlled by suggestion, and that those of sound health and strong concentrative mental ability yield most readily to hypnotic influence.

The real student of psychology — not he whose mind is circumscribed by the narrow limits of the teachings of any one class or school, but he who is ever ready to recognize truth wherever found — will always regret that the radically different views held by these two schools should have been the cause of so much bitterness between them. The warfare which they have waged upon each other has greatly retarded the advance of the science. It is believed that this conflict has been due mainly, if not entirely, to the fact that each has been constantly engaged in the narrow undertaking to prove the correctness of its own pet theory, rather than in the effort to understand why the different methods which they each use to induce hypnotic sleep give practically the same results. Is not this saying of Bacon's applicable to them: "The human mind does not sincerely receive the light thrown upon things, but mixes therewith its own will and passions; thus it makes a science to its tastes. For the truth man most willingly receives is the one he most desires"?

He who hopes to extract the truth from these contradictory and apparently irreconcilable theories must be prepared to accept the following basic propositions, the correctness of which he can easily and satisfactorily demonstrate for himself by investigation and experiment.

First, that the human mind is composed of objective or positive, and subjective or latent faculties. That the positive faculties are those which take note of passing events through the five physical senses. They form the wakeful, reasoning, dominant mind of the individual. That the subjective faculties are those which receive impressions intuitively, suggestively, or through some higher and finer sense

than any of the physical ones. That they never rise above the "realm of consciousness" except when the positive faculties are asleep, in a condition of lethargy closely resembling sleep, or in certain "extraordinary exaltations of the mind." Second, the subjective faculties alone receive hypnotic suggestion. Third, the objective faculties are reduced to a state of hypnotic lethargy by the concentrated mental effort of the individual, aided, it may be, by external suggestion, *but capable of acting entirely independent of it.*

Those who are familiar with the writings and teachings of the ancient philosophers cannot doubt that they indorsed, in its broadest sense, the doctrine of the duality of the mind. As a proof that oriental thinkers have recognized it for many centuries I will say that some years ago, when I first began the study of psychology, I had the good fortune to form the personal friendship of a distinguished Hindu scholar. This philosopher from the Orient was a Brahmin delegate to the World's Congress which convened at Chicago during the Columbian Exposition. During one of the many discussions which we had on this subject he informed me that the duality of the mind was an essential part of the unwritten teaching of occult philosophy, but that the two general divisions were still much further subdivided. These subdivisions, however, are too numerous and too metaphysical to be discussed in an article of this character. The doctrine is now so generally accepted by advanced modern scientists that but little need be said regarding it. Bernheim in his very comprehensive work on "Suggestive Therapeutics" mentions it (see p. 147). Sir William Hamilton discusses and indorses it (see Hamilton's "Metaphysics," p. 36). Surgeon-General Hammond also refers to it in his work entitled "A Treatise on Insanity" (chapter 2); and the theory is unquestionably accepted by such eminent scientists as Proctor, Wigan, Brown-Sequard, Prosper-Despine; and all men of transcendent genius have recognized in themselves some latent mental ability which not only works independently of all ordinary mental effort, but which is beyond the control and direction of the ego.

Hudson was the first writer of ability to discuss intelli-

gently the important bearing which the duality of the mind has upon the science of hypnosis (see Hudson's "Law of Psychic Phenomena," chapter 2).

Those who are familiar with the phenomena of the hypnotic state will readily accept the statement that the latent or subjective mind only receives external suggestions when the objective faculties are asleep or have been rendered lethargic. But the third proposition is the one about which opinions so radically differ. Moll and Ochorowitz, in claiming that subjects may be hypnotized against their will, distinctly deny that hypnotic sleep is self-induced, and all the other psychological scientists, except Bernheim, question it. Yet the very methods which they employ to induce the condition, and the results which they obtain, conclusively prove the correctness of this theory.

Whether the individual is told to gaze intently at a bright object and *think of nothing* but the object (Paris School), or to close his eyes and think intently of nothing while it is suggested to him that he is slowly but surely falling asleep (Nancy School), or to sit in a comfortable position and fix his eyes on the "mesmeric" orbs of the "magician," who makes passes over his body and supercharges his system with subtle magnetic fluid which exudes from his finger-tips, the result is the same. The prolonged, concentrated mental effort *to think of nothing* is the secret of the success of all the methods employed. This effort on the part of the individual himself frees his mind from thought, from nerve stimulation; the blood recedes from the brain-cells; and the mind, more or less gradually according to the temperament of the individual, sinks into that state of lethargy which must precede the effective use of hypnotic suggestion. The latent faculties, thus released from the domination of the positive, are ready to be elevated above the realm of consciousness by having directed to them, by suggestion, the concentrated nerve stimulation which has been shut off from the objective mind.

In explaining the correct theory of hypnotism, and in giving the reason why the subject falls into a state of mental lethargy and becomes amenable to external suggestion, the

question as to whether hypnotism can be induced without the knowledge and against the will of the individual is conclusively answered in the negative. I realize that nearly all the writers on this subject hold views differing from this, but as I am supported by innumerable experiments, by the weight of authenticated facts, and by the opinions of Prof. Bernheim, I feel no hesitancy in expressing my own convictions.

We are now prepared to examine that phase of the subject in which all classes are taking such keen and general interest, namely, whether the power of hypnotic suggestion, which can be so largely used by the skilled psychologist for the good of suffering humanity, may not also be employed by the ignorant or unscrupulous to inflict untold ills upon mankind, and whether the attention of the legislature should be called to the advisability of restraining its use by law. It should be remembered, in this connection, "that though the subjective mind is constantly amenable to suggestion, the strongest suggestion always prevails;" therefore, to answer intelligently the foregoing questions it is necessary to consider to what extent the subjective mind is controlled by *auto-suggestion*.

Bernheim speaks of auto-suggestion as the "deep-rooted idea that nothing can pull up." Hudson describes it "as not only the assertions which the objective mind addresses to its own subjective, but also the habits of thought of the individual, and the settled principles and convictions of his whole life." Albert Moll recognizes this, and attaches the greatest importance to it, and acknowledges that it is frequently impossible to overcome it by any external suggestion, and yet Moll, Bernheim, Forel, Liégeois, and others seem to lose sight of it when they draw such alarming pictures of the dangerous and criminal use of hypnotic suggestion by ignorant and unscrupulous persons. These writers cite a number of cases which, if true, are well calculated to fill the public mind with consternation, and to raise the serious question whether the health, the property, the virtue, and even the lives of a number of people are not constantly at the mercy of the "magnetizer." Nearly all modern writers on hypnotism refer with approval to the well-known Castellan case, reported by Prosper-Despine in 1865, and the Lévy case, reported in 1879.

Both of these were cases where hypnotic influence was supposed to have been exerted over female subjects for immoral purposes, and the defendant in each case was convicted on expert hypnotic testimony and sentenced to confinement in the penitentiary. Most of them also refer to the Tiza-Eslar affair, and Bernheim, Liégeois, Forel, and Ochorowitz mention a large number of experiments which they apparently successfully performed to prove that subjects while in the hypnotic state can be induced to unresistingly part with their property, to perjure themselves on the witness stand, to commit any crime, from a slight misdemeanor to a high-class felony. Liégeois mentions one case in particular where he induced a refined and gentle girl to attempt the life of a near and dear relative with a supposed loaded pistol, and Moll asserts that by hypnotic influence a subject can undeniably be induced to take *his own life*.

When such statements as these are made and indorsed by well-known scientists it certainly becomes the duty of the moralist, the humanitarian, the lawyer, and the physician to examine them with care and with courage. It is believed, however, that none of these cases will stand the test of such an examination. They do not conform to the latest scientific theories regarding psychical phenomena, and they are inconsistent with the rest of the teachings of those who refer to them. It may be confidently asserted that the power of hypnotic suggestion for immoral or criminal purposes, broadly speaking, *depends upon the moral tendency of the hypnotized subject*.

Those whose lives are vitiated and whose tendencies are criminal may unquestionably be induced to commit either moral or legal crime by the influence of hypnotic suggestion. In this case the individual is told to do only what is congenial to his tastes and habits. On the other hand, when the criminal suggestion is addressed to one who is fortified by a pure heart and sound morals it will find no lodgment in his mind. No suggestion can overcome the silent but resistless influence of an enlightened conscience. In the deepest state of somnambulism this divine spark burns with a steady lustre, flooding the soul with a pure and heavenly light. He who



has endowed us with innate consciousness of right to guide us through the labyrinth of temptations which beset our footsteps, and who has given us a free will to resist the foes to morality that ever lie in ambush for us, has not given any one individual the power so to deprive another of conscious responsibility that that other may be forced to leap at one bound the wide gulf which separates vice from virtue.

As conclusive proof of the correctness of this statement, the following authenticated facts are cited :

If a subject can successfully resist a suggestion which will make him appear ridiculous (Moll), will he not more certainly resist one that will make him commit crime? If a man can resist the suggestion which tells him to reveal the secrets of masonry, or any other fraternal order (Moll and Hudson), is it not absurd to contend that he is unable to decline that which would force him to stain his hand with the innocent blood of a fellow man? Would not such a suggestion fill his soul with horror, and would not the shock to his nerve sensibilities at once reestablish objective control over the subjective faculties? If a female subject who suffers from an imaginary disease and has this fanciful idea so deep in her mind that no suggestion can dislodge it (Bernheim), or who, in the deepest state of somnambulism, can resist the suggestion to make herself ridiculous by protruding her tongue in the presence of an audience (Moll and Hudson), is it not unreasonable, to say the least, to claim, as Liégeois does, that she can be made to fire a supposed loaded pistol at a relative with murderous intent? Or if she can refuse to awaken from hypnotic sleep on being told that when she wakes she will be deprived of the power of speech (Pitres approved by Moll), is it not a mockery of common sense to contend, as Bernheim, Liégeois, Forel, and others claim, that she is powerless to resist when she is commanded by suggestion to give up that priceless jewel which is the crowning glory of womanhood, and which a pure woman values not less than her life? The most yielding and "subjective" woman, whose mind is chaste and whose life is blameless, need have no fear of the "magnetic" influence of the "hypnotic magician," for somnambulism cannot silence conscience nor "suggestion" disarm vir-

tue. It is unfortunately true that this result is sometimes accomplished by the deceitful and treacherous arts of him who first possesses himself of her heart and her confidence. These having been given, in a moment of weakness she yields to his temptings just as she would willingly sacrifice her life for him, if necessary. It has not been done, however, and cannot be done, by the use of suggestion alone while she is in a state of hypnotic sleep.

Parlor or office experiments, like those made and relied on by Liégeois and Forel, to prove the power of hypnotic suggestion, are untrustworthy as a basis for scientific calculation. In all such cases the subject goes into the hypnotic sleep conscious that he is to be experimented with; he never entirely loses this consciousness; he is unresisting, and there is no reason why he should not, and every reason why he should, implicitly obey the suggestions of the experimenter.

In this country the effort has been repeatedly made to adopt the plea of hypnotism as a cloak for crime. It is therefore important that jurors, and those who may become jurors, should have some knowledge of the law which governs the production of hypnotic phenomena, so that they may know how much weight ought to be given to such pleas. These defences have been made most frequently in the far West, but general notice has been attracted to them in but three cases, and a Supreme Court has passed upon only one. The Myer case in New York and the Anderson-Gray case in Kansas are still remembered by the public, but the most important one seems to have escaped general notice, namely, that of the State of California *vs.* Worthington, reported in 105 Cal., p. 166. The facts were briefly these: Louise Worthington, a married woman, proved unfaithful, but her husband forgave her. He who had brought discord into her family, on attempting to visit her again, was deliberately shot and killed by her. Her defence was that she was hypnotized by her husband and compelled to commit the crime. The case was carried to the Supreme Court, and that high tribunal held that: "Testimony as to the effect of hypnotism upon those subject to such influence is not admissible upon trial of a defendant accused of murder, where there is no evi-

dence tending to show that the defendant was a subject of hypnotism." Therefore it may be inferred that, if the defendant had been subject to hypnotism, such a defence would have been both admissible and proper. The learned judge who delivered the opinion said, with refreshing ignorance of the entire subject, that there was nothing in the testimony "tending to show that the defendant was subject to the *disease* of hypnotism." In the light of modern science, could anything be more absurd than to speak of hypnotism as a mental disease? If it is a mental disease, no crime which is committed by one under its influence should be punished.

This case is worthy of careful and thoughtful examination, because for the first time in the history of our courts judicial sanction was inferentially given to the possibility of making hypnotic irresponsibility an excuse for civil or criminal misconduct. Once firmly establish this precedent and a way is open for the miscarriage of justice easier than has yet been devised by the wily criminal or the ingenious and unscrupulous advocate.

On account of the misconception which the public has of this whole subject, the mystery which still envelops it, and the supernatural power which the hypnotist is supposed to possess, such pleas cannot fail to become popular.

What subject offers a wider scope for the display of forensic eloquence? through what other medium can such an effective plea be made for the wrongdoer? how else can the sympathies and the passions of a jury be so easily or so profoundly stirred? The plea of insanity, which is always adopted when no other possible excuse can be found for the crime, will be cast aside as a worn-out and useless dodge, and the much more effective one of hypnotism will be substituted in its place.

It has been clearly shown that unless the tendencies of the hypnotized subject are criminal or his morals loose he cannot be influenced by improper suggestion, and that even when these conditions exist he must first allow himself to be hypnotized before the power of suggestion can be employed. It has also been shown that the power of instantaneous

hypnotism is an illusion, and that the magnetizer and the terrible mesmeric eye exist only in the imagination. Therefore, if the subject voluntarily permits himself to be placed in a state of mental irresponsibility, the well-settled principle of law, that a person cannot take advantage of his own misconduct, would govern all such cases. If he voluntarily subjects himself to the power of hypnotic suggestion and while in that condition violates the law of the land, the security of society demands that he shall suffer for his act.

In this connection it may be stated that many writers, in discussing the legal aspect of hypnotism, have undertaken to claim that a witness who has been previously hypnotized can be made to give false testimony while on the witness-stand, and that the attorney can thus, by the aid of post-suggestion, manufacture evidence to suit his case (Bernheim). This might seem a plausible theory if it were not for the fact that, when in the hypnotic state, a subject, as a general rule, is just as amenable to a suggestion from one person as another. Therefore, if in the direct examination he testifies falsely at the suggestion of the counsel who is conducting that part of the examination, on cross-examination he would be completely broken down, and his testimony would not only be worthless, but would be calculated to do the side which produced him absolute injury rather than benefit.

Appreciating the danger which may attend the careless or ignorant use of psychic power for therapeutic purposes and the harm which may be done by it when used for criminal ends, physicians have rather peremptorily demanded that its use shall be limited to themselves. In Europe these demands have been largely complied with. In Russia no physician can hypnotize except in the presence of two others. In Prussia public exhibitions are forbidden, and in France the use of hypnotic suggestion is limited to the medical profession. Before this profession can reasonably claim any right to the sole use of psychic power it should be required to show that physicians are better qualified than other scientists to use the power for the benefit of the afflicted and less liable to employ it for injurious purposes.

Can any facts be produced to show that the members of the medical profession have given more study to this branch of psychology than other advanced thinkers? Have they exerted themselves so energetically in their efforts to place hypnotism on a scientific basis and to make it useful as a therapeutic agent, that they can now consistently demand that its use be restricted to themselves? Does not the whole history of the science prove that it has struggled to its present eminence in the face of their opposition, rather than by the aid of their assistance? Or can it be demonstrated to the satisfaction of any reasonable man that the study of medicine is more elevating to the mind, purifying to the heart, or ennobling to the character than the study of the other sciences, or of law or theology? Physicians are no more platonic, and no more capable of resisting temptation, than other men are, and there is no reason which commends itself to the unprejudiced thinker why the legislature should favor them by restricting hypnotic experiments to their profession. This attempt has been made in two State legislatures, and quite recently some misguided but probably well-meaning gentleman started a motion to petition Congress to take the matter under advisement.

Although in recent years so much of the time of many of the State legislatures has been consumed in debating and passing useless, unwise, and often mischievous measures, it is not probable that either they or Congress will go so far in this direction as to give serious consideration to the unreasonable demands of the medical profession, and thus throw a serious obstacle in the path of this now rapidly advancing psychical science.

Though the history of hypnotism dates back to the beginning of civilization, it has so recently been placed upon a scientific basis that it may be regarded as yet in its infancy. With the light which we now have on the subject no one who has carefully and thoughtfully studied this science will dare to predict what psychical truths its future development may disclose. But it may be safely asserted that, as the subjective faculties become more perfectly developed, many of the mysteries which now puzzle the human understanding

will be made plain. Many of the problems concerning the relationship of the mind and the soul about which philosophers have wrangled so continuously, and with so little benefit to mankind, will doubtless become simplified. Who knows but that then the mysterious veil which no mortal eye has yet pierced, the veil which separates the material from the spiritual, the animal life from the soul life, may be lifted, and the wonders of the unseen universe revealed to man? Thus may death be unmasked, the grave robbed of its terrors, and physical dissolution prove to be but a transition state more to be desired than feared — who knows? These questions will not be satisfactorily answered as long as psychological scientists continue to debate vague and unimportant theories, and refuse to recognize and accept as a basis for their investigations the simple but inflexible law which produces and controls the phenomena of the psychophysiological condition known as hypnotic sleep.



## SUICIDE: IS IT WORTH WHILE?

BY CHARLES B. NEWCOMB.

"I am Knowledge Absolute — Thought Absolute — Bliss Absolute; I am it — I am it." — *From the Sanscrit.*

THERE is a marked increase in the tendency to suicide. This tendency develops oftenest among men. They furnish more than two-thirds of the subjects, and are generally men of intelligence and in responsible positions.

There is but one motive that can drive a man to suicide: *it is fear*. This incentive manifests itself in many different forms. It is generally a fear of the consequences of a man's own acts — loss of reputation, property, health, or happiness. It is an act of supreme selfishness in any case. Suicide is evasion. It is not necessary to offer insanity as an excuse. If it were, we must admit that insanity itself is but the result of egotism. It proceeds from a morbid condition of mind, a danger to which we are all subject when our thoughts dwell too persistently upon ourselves, when we look in instead of out — the danger of inverted thought.

This can arise only from a misconception of life. The remedy lies in a fresh statement. We have lived too much in the marshlands and among the fogs. We have lingered too long in the cemeteries of dead faiths. We have been led astray by the fireflies and *ignes fatui* of false ambitions.

Every individual is a complete judicial system, an autonomy, within himself. He is his own lawmaker, prosecutor, judge, and jury. We are our own jailers. We apply our own thumb screws. We stretch ourselves upon the racks, and handle the levers. It is not "fate" nor "Providence" nor "circumstances" from which we suffer. There is no despot but *self*. Every act of a man's life is sooner or later passed upon by his own conscience. All expiations will be assessed and painfully worked out by and for himself with perfect equity. He governs in his own system myriads of cell life, microbes and elementals, each endowed with an intelligence

of its own, but subject to his rule. This is the true field for the discipline of his powers before he seeks dominion over others. In his own kingdom he must learn to reign supreme. His *purified will* must be accepted as law by the subjects of his personal realm, his own body and own mind.

Life is flexible and plastic, and is moulded by our thoughts. Man is at the same time a pupil and an architect. Let him accept the proposition that all things work together for good, and he will find abundant confirmation of it in his daily life. When we humor our weaknesses they force themselves continually upon our attention like spoiled children. When we assert our mastery of ourselves and compel its recognition we stand secure in our sovereign rights.

The supreme folly of the suicide is in the delusion that by breaking the slate he can solve his problem or escape it. He may for a time attempt the role of truant from life's school, but, like the schoolboy, he only delays his task and complicates it. Sometime, somewhere (and doubtless sooner and nearer than he thinks), these problems of to-day *must be worked out*. There is no reason whatever to suppose that any lesson of life can be really evaded. Dame Nature is an honest and expert accountant. Her debits and credits are kept with unerring accuracy. She herself meets every obligation promptly, and, in her turn, exacts the same of us, and will not be cheated of her dues. How can we be so stupid as not to see that this planetary schoolroom is very beautiful indeed, and contains every appliance helpful to our education? What apparatus is lacking, and where could we find more delightful and entertaining classmates? How unreasonable to whine continually about a distant heaven, like a homesick schoolboy crying for his holiday! Why not improve the golden opportunity of the class-room, and the buoyant life of the playground, with the keen zest of a wholesome, healthy nature?

"The world is so full of a number of things,  
I am sure we ought all to be happy as kings."

To the mature and well-balanced mind every moment of existence is the best, every present plan and circumstance is the one most favorable to its purpose. It looks neither for-

ward nor backward, knows no longings or regrets, experiences neither elation nor depression. It simply *lives*, and life is gladness, strength, and peace.

Life is often called a voyage. Yet on a voyage one would scarcely fling himself overboard because of a foggy day. It has been truly said that "He is a bad sailor who thinks there is no land because he sees nothing but ocean." A good sailor is indifferent to weather. He is as confident in storm as in calm, for is he not equipped with nautical education, experience, and instruments adapted to all the emergencies of the voyage? If the heavens are clouded above, he sails by sounding the depths below. He has learned the science of "dead-reckoning," and he knows no fear. He remembers that

"That night is long that never finds the day."

We often speak of life as a hard taskmaster and as something we should be glad to have done with. We call it an illusion and a dream. But we are beginning to learn (and every discovery of science emphasizes the fact) that death is the only "illusion," and that life in ever-varying form goes on forever. We *cannot* put it away from us. No man can be really burned, drowned, frozen, or buried. He may change his garment, but *he must live on*. Through all experiences he comes unscathed, untouched, and *conscious still*.

Doubtless among the greatest surprises that await us in the future is the realization with a clearer vision than we possess to-day that life is infinitely kind and tender, and wonderfully wise in its adaptation of our experience to our necessities. We shall yet admit that it has been a skilful surgeon performing the necessary operation as gently as we would permit, and alleviating to the utmost the pains of the sufferer. Life itself inflicts no pain upon us. All suffering comes from within. It proceeds from the inharmonious conditions of our own souls. No pang can endure beyond the moment when we have restored harmonious vibration to the mind—have adjusted our own relations to people and events. The necessary and infallible result of mental harmony is health of body, opulence of environment, and love of friends.

Love is the keynote of life. Its harmonies are sublime. It is a magnet of irresistible power which draws to us all things desirable.

Destiny there surely is, but it is a consequence of an inner cause. It is not the arbitrary government of another intelligence.

When one is lost in the forest, and the night comes on, it is wise to "camp down" and wait for daylight. The old huntsman makes himself comfortable by the bivouac fire and lies down cheerfully, knowing well that if he were to keep in motion he might only travel in a circle and exhaust himself in vain. Is not this a wise suggestion for all hours of uncertainty in relation to the affairs of life? We must not be "driven." When we cannot act we must learn the science of waiting — and of waiting cheerfully and confidently — beside our bivouac fires. We need not camp down in the darkness. A few dry boughs, a flint and steel, will bring us warmth and light, and the morning is never far away. A little further on, when the planet has travelled a bit further in its orbit towards the sun, how differently will appear the problems of the night! A little distance only is necessary to evolve harmony from any discord. Nature skilfully readjusts and blends all the vibrations of life in her atmospheres, transforming all to rhythmic chords. Even the deafening noises of the boiler shop, with its hundreds of busy hammers, are turned into a symphony to the listener just across the field.

If we were to dwell long upon the fact that we live in our mortal bodies under a constant atmospheric pressure of fifteen pounds to the square inch we should feel crushed and suffocated. Why do we not suffer? Because the resisting power of the atmosphere within is always equal to the pressure from without. We are permeated and upheld by the same force that surrounds and overhangs us. So in our life of daily responsibility. When we consider only the care that comes from without we feel under constant and violent pressure. When we remember that we live *in* God we know that the universal force can never fail us. It works constantly in and through us as tireless energy. The human

life is as real and important a thing in its orbit as the planetary life of which it is a part. In a sense we ourselves do not breathe. The universal life breathes through us. We do not carry the world on our shoulders. It is the pressure within and without that maintains our centre of gravity and makes life possible and pleasurable.

God, Love, and Life are synonyms. Each comprehends the other, and each is a complete term for the Infinite Energy. We are each a part of the life-blood of the universal system. We are a part of its sensoria and ganglia.

In the great ocean of life, we do not need any artificial life-preservers. The depth is so great it has incalculable buoyancy. We cannot sink. We need not struggle. Every man is by nature a swimmer. Fear often delays the discovery for years. Many a man goes down in sight of shore because he does not know how to throw himself on his back and wait quietly for the relief just at hand.

Any day of life, any moment of time, may be made the starting-point of success. Let us "rejoice as a strong man to run a race."

And should the twilight darken into night,  
And sorrow turn to anguish,  
Be thou strong — thou art in God,  
And nothing can go wrong which a fresh life-pulse  
Cannot set aright,  
That thou dost know the darkness proves the light.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>George Macdonald.

## PLAZA OF THE POETS.

---

### OLD GLORY.

(A SONG.)

BY IRONQUILL.

---

#### 1.

Flag of a thousand battles,  
Beautiful flag of the free;  
Waving from lake to ocean,  
Waving from sea to sea;

Outward and seaward ever,  
Daring the restless wave;  
Upward and skyward ever,  
Pride of the true and the brave.

*Old Glory, Old Glory, the world awaits thy story;  
Float on, float ever on o'er land and sea;  
Old Glory, Old Glory, the world awaits thy story;  
Float on, float on, thou emblem of the free.*

#### 2.

Flag of a thousand battles,  
Cresting the billows of fire;  
Whelming established evils,  
Raising the lowly higher;

Challenging ancient error,  
Silencing tyranny dumb,  
Gladdening and inspiring  
Hope for the year to come!

*Old Glory, Old Glory, the world awaits thy story;  
Float on, float ever on o'er land and sea;  
Old Glory, Old Glory, the world awaits thy story;  
Float on, float on, thou emblem of the free.*



## VITA SUM.

BY JUNIUS L. HEMPSTEAD.

I am Life, the invisible sprite,  
My palace is builded in space;  
With an Ariel's restless flight  
I hurry from place to place;  
I laugh at the plodding of time  
As I flit from star to star;  
I build with a skill sublime  
The forms which the ages mar.

I am Force, but who is it can tell  
How I come, or whither I go?  
I am essence of all; I dwell  
In the current's mysterious flow.  
I am child of electrical birth,  
And flourish from pole to pole;  
With fingers of fire I kindle earth,  
I fill her dark veins with coal.

I am Life; all the atoms my slaves;  
King of sea, and of earth, and sky;  
Of Death, and his phantom graves,  
And of those that forgotten lie  
Down deep in the petrified earth!  
I move, and the edicts of change  
Are laws of eternity's birth,  
That my servants with patience arrange.

I am Life — Life, a protean dream,  
O'ermastered by chemical laws,  
A subtle and magnetic stream  
From Time and its Great First Cause.  
I live in molecular cells,  
In the germ with its latent force,  
In the bud that abounding swells,  
In the seasons' resistless course.

I change with my marvellous skill  
Death's current, so sombre and wide;  
I remake with a sovereign's will,  
From the substance of those who died,

More beautiful houses of clay,  
 Abodes for the conscious soul,  
 Where Will, with its impotent sway,  
 Is a slave to the senses' control.

I am Life! I survive by decay;  
 Selecting the atoms I need,  
 I bring, in correlative play,  
 Through a germ or a latent seed,  
 The forces that men so call —  
 Strong forces as old as time.  
 Forever and over it all  
 I reign with a reign sublime.

---

## GOLD.

BY CLINTON SCOLLARD.

---

Gold! — gold everywhere!  
 A delicate dash of amber in the air,  
 Autumn's bright benison  
 Of haze from the benignant sun.  
 Happy are all the hills  
 Gold-tapestried; and far below,  
 Where flash and flow,  
 Irradiate, the rills,  
 Behold, behold,  
 An undulating field of the cloth of gold!  
 All blends and blurs,—  
 Shades, shadows, half-lights, flood-lights, ministers  
 Of glow and gloom,  
 Into one compact and perfected bloom  
 Of color: tint-ores manifold  
 Fused into gold!

With thee, O heart,  
 Love, with his transmutation fine,  
 E'en as the alchemist Year, has played his part.  
 The present is a gleam with golden shine,  
 And lo! the opening future doth unfold —  
 Gold, — all gold!

## RICHARD REALFE.

BY REUBIE CARPENTER.

His was the poet's heart of strange unrest.  
His thoughts were woven thick with midnight dreams,  
And golden fantasies, and those vague gleams  
Of spirit-light with which the seers are blest.  
Pale-featured Sorrow was his constant guest,  
And every star of joy whose silvery beams  
Fell o'er his path, changed into darkened streams  
Of bitter woe within his joyless breast.

At last Love came, and brought with her such pain  
As burns the heart like flames of fiercest fire,  
And dries up every fount of hope divine;  
He, frenzied, desperate, knowing all was vain,  
With one last parting moan upon his lyre,  
Dashed down Life's goblet, spilled its bitter wine.

## THE DREAMER.

BY HELENA MAYNARD RICHARDSON.

Keen is the wind, and steep the pathway grows  
To where the shaggy brow o'erlooks the sea.  
The clouds hang low. The scudding yachts fast flee  
Before the urging breath of breeze which blows  
Them wide of port. Saluting, comes or goes  
The smoke-stained ship of steam, with deep-voiced key  
That echoes down the shoreland far and free  
And dies amid the gathering mist's repose.

Atop the cliff the dreamer lies a-dream:  
Beneath, the world of men; its paths diverge;  
And all is his to conquer and to claim.  
But motionless, and bound in hush supreme  
Above the dash and roar of beating surge,  
Apart he dreams, and dares to dream of fame.

## THE EDITOR'S EVENING.

### The Greatest Lyric.

**P**OETRY interprets two things — nature and human nature. Besides these, the muse has no other worlds to discover and reveal. Nature is the objective, visible world; human nature is the subjective, invisible world. The singer of the song sees both; but his vision turns to the one or the other according to his temperament, his disposition, and his habits of culture.

In some cases the poet is the poet of nature. For example, our American Bryant is a nature poet, pure and simple. It were difficult to find in the writings of any other bard so much of nature, so little of human nature. From the day of his first outgoings, when he lay musing by the margin of the meadow and traced the distant flight of the waterfowl, while the heavens were aglow "with the last steps of day," to that far time when the veteran poet composed the "Flood of Years," there is hardly a trace of anything but nature and the influences of nature falling on the heart of man.

On the other hand, Longfellow is the poet of human nature. Though he had a soul most susceptible to the influences of the natural world, he nevertheless chooses the human heart for his realm of delight and interpretation. His poetry is ever illumined with the affections and hopes of humanity. Even in those cases in which he begins with nature he always ends with human nature. Standing by the ocean side he beholds the seaweed drifting. He muses on the autumnal equinox and the gigantic storm-wind that falls on the deep and lashes shoreward the laboring surges. He discovers in vision the far regions of the water-world from which the seaweed comes. He hears the soft waves murmuring on the Bermudian corals and the hoarse breakers roaring on the rock-bound Hebrides. He thinks of the mysterious sea-stream bearing its unmeasurable volume of warmth from the tropics into the frozen gulfs of the North. But he cannot finish with the sea vision *as such*; he turns to the poetic an-

alogy in *life*, and the whole force of his thought expends itself in developing the imagery of the invisible empire :

So when storms of wild emotion  
Smite the ocean  
Of the Poet's soul, ere long  
From each cave and rocky fastness  
In the vastness  
Floats some fragment of a song.

Anon we find a poet who is a singer of both nature and human nature. Of this kind was the late immortal Laureate of England. Tennyson's preëminence rises upon the double abutment of the visible and the invisible world. He blended the two elements in his song ; and the imperishable beauty of much of his work depends upon the blending.

It is this happy union of the objective and visible with the subjective and invisible that has given to the " Bugle Song " its strong hold on the sympathy of the English-speaking race, and has brought a virtual consensus of judgment that it is the finest lyric in our language. Note the unconscious ease and beauty with which the elements of the natural and spiritual worlds are mingled in this masterpiece. On what does the splendor fall ? Not on mere mountain peaks and cliffs and precipices, but on *castle walls*. Yonder, on the heights, stood the old castles of the feudal ages, with moats and drawbridges ready for romance or battle. Human interests were there. True enough, the poet's vision falls on " snowy summits," but they are *old in story*.

Through the first and part of the second stanza there is no suggestion that any other than the poet is standing with him and viewing the splendid scene. In the second stanza he introduces Elfland. The element of life, even the life of the Little World, cannot escape his sympathy and discernment. If there are echoes of the actual bugle falling across the lake and returning from cliff and scar, those echoes are not merely the rebound of sound ; they must be the little music blown from the horns of Elfland. The Elves blow, and the purple glens reply, and the echoes recede faintly, faintly, into the silence.

Then, in the third stanza, we discover that the poet has not been musing aloud so much as pointing out and interpreting

the scene to *another* soul beside him. In the beginning of this stanza he addresses that other soul; he tells her that while the echoes of the actual bugle die away into silence — while they fade to nothing in the rich sky that overspans the world of sense and sorrow — there are other echoes that do not melt into silence. The voices of the soul, as the syllables of the bugle, flung forth on the infinite air, roll from soul to soul, and grow forever and forever.

There is thus in the Bugle Song a sudden involution of all the visible landscape — of snowy summits and castle walls and lakes and cataracts and cliffs and scars; and there is the equally sudden and beautiful evolution of *another world* — the invisible world of hope and love. The Bugle Song thus enfolds in its drapery the sublimest elements of nature and the purest elements of human nature, and the echo, like that of the soul itself, will continue to resound and fly from the crags and valleys of life through all centuries until our mother tongue shall no longer carry from heart to heart its messages of peace.

---

**"Thrift, Thrift, Horatio."**

A patriot in exile went on Bunker Hill day to see the *Collis Sacer*. He went alone; for solitude, even in the cityful, fits the mind for communion with the great.

The great were not wanting on that sloping hill, in the June meadow, a hundred and twenty-two years ago. There were men in Breed's pasture on that day who wore hunting shirts and belts with powder-horns and leather bags filled with chawed bullets, who, on another planet, would have been gods, not by courtesy, but by right. Being on earth, they were shot and killed in freedom's cause, and for a century at least it seemed that their fame was immortal.

Old Boston was proud of her heroes. She reared an obelisk of granite not unworthy of her patriot dead. The Man of Marshfield, when the writer of this note was still a blinking baby, said some immortal things at the foot of that everlasting shaft. Now the exile went to Bunker Hill to muse on these things, and to drop a possible tear of affection and veneration on the spot where Joe Warren and old Israel



Putnam and Prescott and Gridley and the other heroes fought in the trenches and fell back into immortality.

The exile tried to revoke the greatness and the glory of the event and the actors. He paid his tribute at the foot of the statues of Prescott and Warren, and was permitted by an official to ascend to the top of the monument where the old battered guns are kept. *For this privilege he was charged twenty cents!* From the top of the obelisk he looked down and saw *six fakirs gesticulating in quack-carts just outside of the enclosure.* They shouted and vociferated about their fraudulent wares and accursed tricks to a lot of ignoramuses, to whom Bunker Hill signified as much as the Parthenon would signify to as many Bushmen!

Twenty cents for admission! A fakir crying his wares at the base of Bunker Hill! Business is business.

---

#### The Pessimist.

It is the fashion to decry pessimism as the shabbiest vice of the civilized life. To be a pessimist is to incur the aversion and contempt of the world. To be an optimist is, according to the rhythm of the age, the highest of the virtues. For this reason they who would avoid censure and they who would gather praise must shun the pessimistic and follow the optimistic gonfalon.

But there are pessimists and pessimists. Old Thersites was a pessimist. His head indicated it. Homer says that the head of Thersites was "piled up behind." The wearer of that head used to go about the Greek camp at Troy finding fault with everything. He criticised Agamemnon, king of men. He mocked at the conduct of the siege. He quarrelled with everybody, even the sutlers and camp-followers. He could not keep the peace, insomuch that the mild-mannered Ulysses was obliged one day to whip him. When the queen of the Amazons was slain Thersites plucked out her eyes; he could not forbear to make even Death worse than it was. He went on in this career of truculent fault-finding and mockery and denunciation of everything and praise of nothing until the soured and terrible Achilles — himself something of a pessimist — got hold of him and killed him.

That was the end of Thersites, but not the end of his kind. The original mocker has descendants. They are plentifully scattered through all the civilized races. There seems to be a certain type of character which cannot be satisfied with anything but criticism and denunciation of things as they are. We heartily agree that this type is the gadfly on the back of humanity. Under the sting of the gadfly humanity writhes and twists and plunges, but cannot shake Thersites off.

But there is another pessimist of a different order. Him we appreciate; him we honor with brief eulogy. I should think that every good physician in the world is a pessimist, for it is his business to discover ailment and to make memorandum of what it is. The physician may be never so hopeful about the ultimate condition of his patient. He may be never so confident that the dreadful epidemic will at length subside; but in the interim he relaxes no jot of effort to discover the seat of infection, to tell the authorities what it is that is breeding death, and to get a wholesome quarantine established around the borders of the infected district.

In this wise proceeds every sane philosopher. What a fool is he who supposes that civilization is a healthy subject! What a quack is he who, knowing the infected provinces in the Empire of Life, says that he does not believe there is an infection, and that indeed he doubts whether there is malady anywhere! What a poltroon is he who calls the discovery and uncovering of infection and plague the bugaboo of a pessimist! Albeit, the quack knows that the spurious all-is-well diagnosis goes for much with the folks of his neighborhood, and that the increment to his own estate will be large in proportion to the hygienic flattery which he dispenses.

Of this kind of quack and poltroon the world is full. The easy optimist abounds. He constitutes a part of the vociferous majority who mob-like howl down the wind the wholesome, courageous pessimist who dares to diagnosticate the maladies of his age and country. Behold how every genuine man and woman who has the courage of conviction and does that courage into word and deed shall be assailed and vituperated! His criticism and his warning will be turned ever to his hurt. Popularity belongs to the *laudator temporis acti*.

Contumely follows the steps of whoever speaks the sarcasm of truth and administers the irony of righteousness.

Take for example such a man as James Russell Lowell. What does he fling into the face of the age? Here is his message in a single verse :

*" Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne."*

What does the loud world say in answer? The loud world denies it. The loud world rushes to a political meeting and catches with open mouth the harangue administered by the Honorable Donovan Maginty of the Sixth Ward, who declares in stentorian rhetoric that the world was never before so good and sweet, society was never before so pellucid and sunlit, and man was never before so rich in virtue and health. None the less, it was Lowell and not the Honorable Maginty who delivered the imprisoned truth to his fellow men, taking upon himself cheerfully the ill fame of pessimism, if thereby he might conduce a little to the betterment of mankind. The beautiful but sad aphorism of the poet stands like a great rock in the noisy swell of the breakers, challenging and flinging back their impotent assailing waters ; for Truth *is* forever on the scaffold, and Error *is* forever on the throne : only, at last, we shall pull down the error and crown the truth.

---

#### The Physician's Last Call.

He rose at midnight, fevered and worn out

With forty years of service to mankind !

A young wife waited for the master mind

To save her in the hour of hope and doubt.

He gave her baby to her, turned about

And staggered homeward through the darkness — blind

With toil and vigil, and was fain to find

Death and surcease from life's distracted rout !

Small was the box of silver-bronze that held

The treasured ashes ! It was Freedom's Day,

And overhead the sky was deeply blue.

We left the casket ! Death and fire had felled

Our girdled cedar ! He had gone away

Who did his duty till the fight was through.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

[In this Department of THE ARENA no book will be reviewed which is not regarded as a real addition to literature.]

### A Bard of the Ohio.<sup>1</sup>

From the poetry of our day I select that of Madison Cawein as an example of conspicuous merit. Many American readers have enjoyed Mr. Cawein's productions. His Muse is a welcome visitant in the parlors and summer-houses of high-up people in all parts of our country. But the appreciation of his poetry has never been as great as its merits would indicate. His poems are rather *too good* to be caught up on the babbling tongue and cast forth into mere popularity. They are caviare to the general; and yet they have in them the best elements of popular favor.

Cawein is a classicist. He will have it that poems, however humble the theme, however tender the sentiment, shall wear a tasteful Attic dress. I do not intimate that Mr. Cawein's mind has been too much saturated with the classical spirit or that his native instincts have been supplanted with Greek exotics and flowers out of the renaissance, but rather that his own mental constitution is of a classical as well as a romantic mould.

No true poet, I presume, can help being a poet, or can refrain from exhibiting his divine weakness to mankind. Poetry is a form of spiritual dream which it were impossible to suppress; and how dismal withal the world would be without it! If the logicians and mathematicians could have their way, if the philosophers could rule, if the scholastics issuing from their fuliginous dust-heaps could prevail over all spiritual and sentimental conditions, to be sure what a dreadful reign of death we should have! What an empire of bones!

Madison Cawein has now published at least five volumes of poems; and they are all worth while. I find mentioned also "Lyrics and Idyls" and "The Triumph of Music," which I have not seen in separate form — these besides the five publications

<sup>1</sup> "Days and Dreams." Poems, by Madison Cawein, author of "Lyrics and Idyls," "The Triumph of Music," etc. One volume 12mo. Pp. 173. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London, 1891. "Moods and Memories." By the same. One volume 12mo. Pp. 310. Same publishers, New York and London, 1892. "Red Leaves and Roses." By the same. One volume 12mo. Pp. 205. Same publishers, 1893. "Poems of Nature and Love." By the same. One volume 12mo. Pp. 211. Same publishers, 1893. "Intimations of the Beautiful and Other Poems." By the same. One volume 8vo. Pp. 208. Same publishers, 1894.

which are before me. "Days and Dreams" appeared in 1891. In the following year "Moods and Memories" was published. In 1893 "Red Leaves and Roses" and "Poems of Nature and Love" were sent out; and in 1894 "Intimations of the Beautiful" followed, completing the series, all from the press of the Putnams. But let no one think that the series will end with the present fytte. Cawein is a constant writer. His poems appear in the current magazines of the last two years, *rari in gurgite vasto*, as the pale shade of Mantua would say, and I do not doubt that a new volume will soon be given to the public.

The themes of Cawein's poetry are generally taken from the world of romance. If there be any modern bard who can recreate a mediæval castle and give to its inhabitants the sentiments which were theirs in the twelfth century, Cawein is the poet who can. He takes delight in the East. He is the Omar Khayyam of the Ohio Valley. He is as much of a Mohammedan as a Christian. He knows the Son of Abdallah better than he knows Cromwell; and has more sympathy with a Khalif than with a Colonel. He dwells in the romantic regions of life; but the romance is real. The hope is a true hope. The dream is a true dream. The picture is a painting, and not a chromo. The love is a passion, and not a dilettante episode. Cawein's art is a genuine art. His verse is exquisite. Out of the three hundred and thirteen poems in the five volumes under consideration there may be found hardly a false step or broken harmony.

The sympathetic reader will note in Mr. Cawein's poems the marks of steady poetical development. How subtle are those touches by which genius reveals itself in the evolution from youth to maturity, and from maturity to full flight! In the poems which make up "Days and Dreams" there are distinct traces of the youthful dreams which give to life its keenest charm. Out of "One Day and Another" the following stanzas reveal the impatience of the waiting lover:

The owls are quavering, two, now three,  
And all the green is graying;  
The owls our trysting dials be —  
There is no time for staying.  
I wait you where this buckeye throws  
Its tumbled shadow over  
Wood-violet and the bramble-rose,  
Long lady-fern and clover.

The volume of "Moods and Memories" is the most extensive which Mr. Cawein has published. It represents the second

stage in the poet's fancy; for in these songs he begins to be reflective. He writes much of nature, and shows extreme happiness in depicting the aspects of the landscape. Thus, for example, in the poem on "Frost" Cawein reveals the finest poetical fancy:

White artist he, who, breezeless nights,  
From tingling stars jocosely whirls,  
A harlequin in spangled tights,  
His wand a pot of pounded pearls.

The field a hasty palette; for  
In thin or thick, with daub and streak,  
It stretches from the barn-gate's bar  
To the bleached ribbon of the creek.

Or again, in the poem on "Indian Summer" how sweet is the discernment:

The dawn is a warp of fever,  
The eve is a woof of fire;  
And the month is a singing weaver  
Weaving a red desire.

Or again, how beautifully pathetic is the sketch of "A Dead Lily:"

The South had saluted her mouth  
Till her mouth was sweet with the South.

The North, with its breathings low,  
Made the blood of her veins like his snow.

The West, with his smiles and his art,  
Poured the honey of life in her heart.

The East had in whisperings told  
Her secrets more precious than gold.

So she grew to a beautiful thought  
Which a godhead of love had wrought.

The little volume of "Red Leaves and Roses" contains several of Cawein's most beautiful productions. It is made up of the longer poems "Wild-Thorn and Lily," "The Idyl of the Standing-Stone," "An Epic of South-Fork," etc., with intervening songs, some of which are as beautiful as our style of new singing may make them. In this volume the romantic and far-off spirit of Cawein shows itself more strongly than hitherto. Thus in "Thamus" behold the setting of the story:

And it is said that Thamus sailed  
Off islands of Ægean seas  
No seaman yet had ever hailed,  
No merchant yet had sailed to these,  
Phœnician or the Chersonese.



Like shadows on a shadow-ship  
 The dark-haired, dark-eyed sailors lay,  
 When from the island seemed to slip,  
 Borne overhead and far away,  
 A voice that "Thamus!" seemed to say.

In the fourth volume of the series the poet communes much with nature, and is a little saddened with the retrospect of life; for the young singer as well as the veteran has the power of retrospect. I quote a stanza from "The Forest Pool:"

One memory persuades me when  
 Dusk's lonely star burns overhead,  
 To take the gray path through the glen —  
 That finds the forest pool, made red  
 With sunset — and forget again,  
 Forget that she is dead.

In the volume called "Intimations of the Beautiful" the poet is nearer to us in time, and nearer to us in spirit than in his preceding work. A single extract may serve as a sample of the sixty beautiful pieces composing the collection. "In Shadow" is a love song, and there is much of this divine passion in all of Cawein's poems. Sometimes he plays delicately with the sentiment; sometimes he springs into the river and swims away. Or sometimes he stands half-hidden by overhanging vines breathing out in sweet cadences the sorrowful plaint within. Thus in the poem to which I have referred he saddens us into a sigh with a glimpse at a marble index over the grave of some bygone love:

A moth sucks in a flaming flower:  
 The moon beams on the old church-tower:  
 I watch the moth and waning moon —  
 A moth-white slip —  
 One silver tip  
 In ghostly tree-tops, drifting soon  
 To gleam above the church an hour.  
 My soul is sad as any bloom  
 The moonlight haunts beside a tomb;  
 So very weary with the love  
 No words may speak —  
 Oh, wild and weak! —  
 Here where thy tombstone's marble dove  
 Makes of the moonlight plaintive gloom.

## THE ARENA FOR NOVEMBER.

### TO OUR PATRONS AND FRIENDS:

We appeal to all who are concerned in the people's cause to aid in its promotion. Friends of Reform and Freedom, THE ARENA is fighting your battle! If you are sincere, as we are sincere, in this conflict, support the one great magazine which stands true to your interests. If you wish success to the champion of popular liberties, the defender of the rights of man, then show your devotion and earnestness by subscribing for THE ARENA and by inducing your friends to subscribe.

### "Freedom and Its Opportunities."

In THE ARENA for November the battle for the betterment of conditions will be waged as hotly as ever. The first article, "*Freedom and Its Opportunities*," will be by Governor John R. Rogers, of Washington. The portrait of the author will stand as frontispiece to the number. Governor Rogers considers what human freedom is, what its worth is to mankind, and how the enjoyment of freedom is impeded.

### A Labor Symposium.

One of the most interesting features of THE ARENA for November will be a symposium entitled "*The Laborer's View of the Labor Question*." To this the contributors are Herbert M. Ramp, of Missouri; W. E. Edwards, of Ohio; and William Emory Kearns, of Kansas.

### Blow at the Telegraph Monster.

In THE ARENA for November Professor Frank Parsons will continue his arduous fight with the telegraph monopoly. This will be his fourteenth article and not the least powerful of the series.

### Initiative and Referendum.

No subject in the policy of the United States possesses greater or more vital interest to political reformers than does

that of the *Initiative and Referendum* as a method of legislation. The advantages and feasibility of the new system over the present abusive and inefficient method will be strongly set forth in THE ARENA for November by Elihu F. Barker.

### Haupt on the Railroad in Politics.

In THE ARENA for November Lewis M. Haupt, Chairman of the Colombia-Cauca Arbitration Commission, will contribute a brief but admirable article entitled "*The Railroad as a Political Factor*."

### Judge George H. Smith on Bimetallism.

In THE ARENA for November Judge George H. Smith, of Los Angeles, will contribute a powerful article in review of Giffen's "*Case Against Bimetallism*." Judge Smith is an able writer and thoroughly informed on the subject.

### B. O. Flower's Contribution.

Mr. B. O. Flower will continue his special contributions with an excellent article in November. His title is "*Practical Measures for Promoting Manhood and Preventing Crime*."

### How Poor the Rich Are!

In the number for November a brilliant little article entitled "*Poor 'Fairly Rich' People*" will be contributed by H. M. Foster. Mr. Foster is a satirist, and his contribution is a witty and ironical exposition of how poor "fairly rich people" may be in their own estimation.

### History as a Science.

In THE ARENA for November the Editor will discuss the subject of "*History as Science*."

The other parts of THE ARENA will be the "*Plaza of the Poets*," The Editor's Evening, Book Reviews, etc.